

313311
A STUDY OF PARENTAL SUPPORT AND CONTROL TECHNIQUES

by
LO CHU YIN-KWAN

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

1984

thesis
H Q
735.8
L 6

449646



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To accomplish an empirical study like the present one is a painstaking task. Without the encouragement and enlightenment of many around me, such a task would be a failure. I am very much indebted to my adviser Mrs. Betsy Chau who is always so warm and understanding to me especially during my gloomy days. She shared with me much of her insight and experience in parental support and control and is particularly effortful in guiding my thinking on the research problem and design, especially on the operationalization of concepts. Also, I would not forget the kind of help I attained from Dr. Agnes M.C. Ng, who shed a lot of light on my research design especially at its formulation stage. I am also very grateful to Dr. Lau Sing who had given me many ideas on my research methodology especially on the part of measurement, reliability and validity. I would also like to present a sincere vote of thanks to Professor Rance P.L. Lee for his invaluable advice on the part of statistical analysis.

I am very thankful to the Social Welfare Department for making my study possible. Also, I am very much grateful to the Principals of the fourteen schools who supported my study by selecting their students and arranging room facilities for the interviews. Their kind co-operation has made my study a smooth process.

Above all, my gratefulness must be extended to my dear husband Raymond. He never complained on my long hours of study and deliberately shouldered up most of the family responsibilities including caring of my two sons - Jonathan, aged four years and Joseph, aged four months. Last but not

least, I would like to present my utmost thanks to my parents who had loved me, guided me and taught me in a way that I am confident and secure enough to render adequate support and control to my children.

A B S T R A C T

The purpose of the present research is to study the relationship between parental support, control and children's non-compliance. A two group comparison was adopted to explore the differences between mothers of the compliant students and mothers of the non-compliant students. One hundred and twenty compliant students and the same number of non-compliant students were chosen by the teachers of fourteen registered Primary Schools in Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping from Primary One to Primary Three. The mothers of these two groups of students were compared in terms of parental support and control. They were matched for housing type, living area, marital status and accomodation with child, in order to isolate factors which might be extraneous to the results of the study.

The data were collected by means of personal interviews with the two groups of mothers. In the interview schedule, the questionnaire included basic personal characteristics and the following measurements: 1) measurement of parental support (20 items) and 2) measurement of parental control (20 items). Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient Test was used to test the reliability levels of the measuring instruments and the results were satisfactory. Face validity was also ensured by seeking the professional advice of teachers, principals and social workers.

The t-test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the means of the two groups. The Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient was employed to describe and summarize the strength and direction of the association. The significance of difference was set at the 0.05 level.

The findings confirmed the three major hypotheses in the study. Hypothesis I that there is an inverse relationship between parental support and child non-compliance was confirmed. Hypothesis II that there is an inverse relationship between parental control and child non-compliance was also confirmed. Non-compliant children are receiving lower parental support and control from their mothers. Statistical findings also support Hypothesis III that there is significant difference between the two groups of mothers in the overall parental support and control.

Implications of this study include implementation of parent groups in school setting, re-education of parents by behavioural techniques, provision of audio-visual aids and need for staff training on effective parenting. As a follow-up to the present study, an in-depth research exploring the determinants of parental authority is recommended.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
Foreign Studies on Parental Support and Control	5
Local Studies on Parental Support and Control	9
III THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	14
A Child's Basic Needs and Parental Support and Control	14
Approaches Explaining a Child's Non-compliant Behaviour	16
IV RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	24
Hypotheses and Definitions	24
Design and Method	31
Selecting a locale for survey	33
Universe of the Study	34
Sampling	36
Instrument for Measurement	39
Pilot Test	43
Data Collection	44
Data Analysis	45

	<u>Page</u>
V PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS	49
Profile of Students	49
Profile of Mothers	52
VI A COMPARISON OF THE TWO GROUPS OF MOTHERS IN THE ASPECTS OF PARENTAL SUPPORT AND CONTROL	68
VII THE CORRELATION BETWEEN PARENTAL SUPPORT, CONTROL TECHNIQUES AND CHILDREN'S NON-COMPLIANCE	84
VIII A TYPOLOGY OF PARENTAL SUPPORT AND CONTROL	91
IX CONCLUSION	95
Summary and Research Plan	95
Summary of Findings	96
X RECOMMENDATION AND LIMITATIONS	98
APPENDIX I QUESTIONNAIRE ON CHILDREN'S NON-COMPLIANCE	104
APPENDIX II QUESTIONNAIRE ON CHILDREN'S NON-COMPLIANCE (CHINESE VERSION)...	107
APPENDIX III QUESTIONNAIRE ON PARENTAL SUPPORT AND CONTROL	109
APPENDIX IV QUESTIONNAIRE ON PARENTAL SUPPORT AND CONTROL (CHINESE VERSION)	128
BIBLIOGRAPHY	138

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
V-1	Class of Students	49
V-2	Age of Students	50
V-3	Sex of Students	51
V-4	Age of Mothers	52
V-5	Years of Stay in Hong Kong	53
V-6	Mothers' Education	54
V-7	Fathers' Education	55
V-8	Mothers' Work	56
V-9	Mothers' Occupation	57
V-10	Fathers' Occupation	58
V-11	Mothers' Working Hours	59
V-12	Fathers' Working Hours	60
V-13	Family Income	61
V-14	Housing Type	62
V-15	Living Area of Respondents	63
V-16	Number of Children	64
V-17	Birth Order of Children	65
V-18	Mothers' Religion	66
VI-1	Use of Warm Tonation	69
VI-2	Concern for Child	70
VI-3	Conversation with Child	71
VI-4	Physical Expression of Affection.....	72
VI-5	Comparison of Parental Support	73

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
VI- 6 Comparison of Parental Support Scores.....	74
VI- 7 Methods of Punishment.....	76
VI- 8 Explanation of Consequence of Behaviour after Punishment	77
VI- 9 Participation in Household Wrok	78
VI-10 Methods of Approval	79
VI-11 Respect for Obedience as a Positive Value	80
VI-12 Comparison of Parental Control	81
VI-13 Comparison of Parental Control Scores	82
VII-1 Distribution of Parental Support Between the Compliant and Non-compliant Group	85
VII-2 Distribution of Parental Control Between the Compliant and Non-compliant Group	86
VIII-1 Typology of Parental Support and Control	93

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Over the years, many people have been puzzling about the general question of how children's attitudes and behaviours are influenced by their interaction with significant others, specifically parents. As observed from many cases receiving professional help from welfare agencies in Hong Kong, there is an observation that among those cases which come up with behavioural problems of the children in initial contacts are later found that their parents are usually either inadequate in parental support or weak in their control techniques. This is especially true in the lower socio-economic package where parents are more exposed to stressful life circumstances for example high living density, low personal privacy, stringent family income and large family size. With a lower educational level and being less expressive in their affects, quite a number of Chinese parents encounter problems in rendering adequate parental support and control. As a result, their children's attitude and behaviour are affected. Therefore, it is worthwhile to launch out an exploratory study of parental support and control techniques in urban areas with lower socio-economic status, so as to achieve a better understanding of its relation to the behavioural problems of children.

In this research, Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping Estates are chosen as the area of study. Both of them are located in Kwun Tong area. These two estates are chosen because they are two of the largest urban low-cost public housing estates in Hong Kong. There are twenty-four blocks in Lam Tin Estate housing 77,495 residents and forty-five blocks in Sau Mau Ping Estate accomodating 104,708 residents. As there are

2.1 million people living in public housing estates, the population of Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping is about 9 percent of the total public housing population. It seems that to a considerable extent, the residents can represent some parenting characteristics of the urban low income families. Second, in the history of public housing provision, Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping Estates belong to the category of "old-fashioned estates" with Mark III to Mark VI design. The earliest units were rehoused around 1964 to 1966 and the latest units were rehoused around 1971 to 1974. (Figures released by Public Relations Section of Housing Department in September, 1983). When compared with the recently constructed public housing estates, Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping Estates provide less space and less modern household facilities for the families. In general, the living space per person is only thirty-five to forty-five square feet and congestion is often experienced. Third, since these two estates had been constructed for almost twenty years, they are already rather polluted by the processes of industrialization, modernization and urbanization. Families living in these two estates may possess their own characteristics in life-style and parenting patterns.

It is within such a socio-economic package that this project is based upon. The point of interest is - within the same socio-economic strata, will there be differing parental support and control styles between two groups of parents? These two groups of parents are chosen on the basis of their children's degree of non-compliance in the

school setting. In other words, the design uses a two group comparison. Parents with compliant children will be compared to parents with non-compliant children in the aspects of support and control techniques. Compliant and non-compliant children are assessed by school staff in respect of their conduct problems in the school setting. In this way, two groups of children are identified - one group assessed as compliant children and the other group assessed as non-compliant children by their teachers. The term "compliance" and "non-compliance" is used instead of "good conduct" and "bad conduct" to avoid moralistic overtones. The school authority's professional judgement is used to discriminate between the compliant and non-compliant group because the teachers are professionally trained and their choice is more objective and reliable. In this study, children from Primary One to Three will be randomly selected. They are within the age bracket of six to ten and children of this age range are still under the dominant influence of their parents. Peer influence exists but the impact is quite small when compared with parental influence. There is a pressing need to identify at an early age those children who are at the risk of developing conduct problems and to find and develop methods for behaviour modification, especially on the aspect of effective parent training. The knowledge gained from this study will enhance better understanding about the appropriate role of parents in shaping their children's behaviour and will also shed light upon family life education policy and programmes. Apart from the densely populated Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping Estates, these

programmes may also be applied to other public housing estates with similar characteristics such as Tze Wan Shan Estate, Wong Tai Sin Estate and Tai Hang Tung Estate etc.

The theme of this research is to study the support and control techniques of the parents as well as the respective correlation with their children's non-compliance in the school setting. Parents with non-compliant children will be compared to parents with compliant children. Three main research questions are raised:

- 1) Does parental support significantly correlate with the child's non-compliant behaviour?

Is the parental support of the parents with non-compliant children less adequate than that with compliant children?

- 2) Do parental control techniques significantly correlate with the child's non-compliant behaviour? Are the control techniques of the parents with non-compliant children less effective than those with compliant children?

- 3) Is there any significant difference between mothers of the compliant group and mothers of the non-compliant in the aspect of parental support and control?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Foreign Studies on Parental Support and Control

Definition of Parental Support and Control Techniques

According to Straus (1967, p.7-21), support is conceptualized as establishing, maintaining or restoring a positive, affective climate among family members or emotional and expressive role behaviours. Ellis and Rollins (1976, pp.713-722) hold similar viewpoint but their definition is more concrete. They use the term support to refer to that interaction characterized by nurturance, warmth, approval and other positive sentiments from the parents to the child. This is similar to the description offered by Thomas, Franks and Colonico (1974, pp.10-11) who note that supportive parents are those parents who generally approve of the child's efforts to produce an effect upon the environment, and simultaneously let the child know that they are there if he or she needs them.

On the other axis, Straus (1967, pp.7-21) defines control techniques as actions which initiate change, or modify behaviours of other family members or instrumental and disciplinary role behaviours (Straus 1967). Flavell (1977, p.63) uses the term control technique to designate all those behaviours that an individual employs to change the ongoing course of another person's activity. Their function is to channel behaviour in certain directions, inhibiting some tendencies and enhancing others. They are all of those communications

from one individual to another that are designated to impel, inhibit, direct, guide, shape or influence the recipient's behaviour. Although they can be found in the interaction of any two or more individuals, their significance is particularly marked in the encounters of parent and child. A third definition of parental control is contributed by Diana Baumrind (1971, p.87). By firm control is meant firm enforcement of rules, effective resistance to the child's coercive demands, and willingness to guide the child by regime and structured interventions.

So support and control are two important dimensions of parental behaviour that influence a child's attitude and behaviour.

Definition of non-compliance

Non-compliance is a major component of the conduct disorder "syndrome". It is also referred to as "negativism" or "oppositional" behaviour. Non-compliance is closely bound up with the concept of a deviation from some social norm. The word "norm" denotes a standard, rule or pattern in the Latin from which it is derived. And when a behaviour is designated as "non-compliant", it generally implies a deviation from a standard within a social context. (Herbert, 1978, p.17). It takes many forms. In the classroom, the child may defy the teacher, may refuse to work, getting out of his seat at will, leaving the classroom, talking loudly to his neighbour, or molesting him. The net effect is the disruption of all order and concentration. In the home, the child may refuse to obey the mother's command or does the opposite of what she asks. In several studies, such negativism has been isolated as an

important class of behaviour pathology in early childhood.
(Levy, 1955, Patterson and Brodsky, 1966).

The Relationship between parental support,
Control and Non-compliance in Children

Rollins (1967), based on the work of Decker (1964) and Straus (1964 a) indicates that if the child grows up experiencing high parental support and high control, he will be high on rule enforcement and compliance. If a child experiences high parental support and low control, then he will be high on disobedience and non-compliance. If a child experiences low parental support and high control, he will be high on non-compliance and aggression. If a child experiences low support and low control, then he will be high on non-compliance.¹

Among developmental psychologists there is also wide acceptance of the notion that parental firm control, when coupled with parental warmth, promotes effective socialization - that is parental firm control promotes the development of such qualities as social responsibility, self-control, independence and high esteem in children (Mussen, Conger and Kagan, 1974 and Maccoby, 1980). Coopersmith (1967) studied the parental attitudes and practices associated with self-esteem in the ten twelve-year-old middle-class boys. He summarized his findings that antecedents of self-esteem can be given in terms of three conditions: total or nearly total acceptance of the children by their parents, clearly defined and enforced limits, and the respect and latitude for individual action that exists within the defined limits.

Another source of data that has had a major effect on theory related to parental control and support is the work of Baumrind (1967, 1971 a, 1971 b, 1973) and of Baumrind and Black (1967). Firm parental control and enforcement when coupled with warmth and reasoning is associated with competence and self-control in nursery school-age children (Baumrind, 1967); and with purposive, dominant and achievement-oriented behaviour in boys of nursery-school age (Baumrind, 1971 a).² For pre-school children, Baumrind and Black (1967) found correlations between firm parental control and likable, autonomous, imaginative, and confident behaviour in boys and well-socialized and tractable behaviour in girls. To summarize, Baumrind's findings indicate the importance of parental control and support as a predictor of competence and compliance in early childhood.

Bandura and Walters (1959), Glueck and Glueck (1950), MacCord and Howard (1961) found that higher demands were made by parents of least hostile or delinquent children. Also, parents of delinquent boys were less restrictive. This is also illustrated by the Cambridge longitudinal study of delinquent development (West, 1967; West and Farrington, 1973). All boys were recruited from six primary schools in a working-class area of London when they were in their fourth year at school, aged eight to nine years. They were followed up until the youngest had passed seventeen years of age, thus giving the complete juvenile offending record. A comparison was made of those who became delinquent with the non-delinquent remainder on 151 variables considered to be important precursors of delinquency. Of interest is the finding that many of these anti-social children had parents who were lax in providing

discipline and supervision. Many of these children opposed requirements set by their parents, their schools, and their communities in general. Their parents were unable or unwilling to cope with the problem. Robins (1966) attests to the importance of such disciplinary problems by describing instances in which strict or adequate discipline decreased the probability for some of the children of developing adult sociopathic disorders. Similar findings are supported by Kallarackal and Herbert (1976). Indian children, carefully supervised and strictly disciplined in loving homes, showed remarkably low rates of maladjustment compared with an English contrast group, despite the cultural and educational difficulties of being immigrants in Britain and stresses of living in the twilight areas of an industrial city. Finney (1961) found that while rigidity was associated with covert hostility in children, firm control was associated with conscience development. Following this line, Pikas (1961), in his survey of 656 Swedish adolescents, showed that significant differences occurred in their acceptance of parental authority, depending upon the reason for the directive. Authority which was based on rational concern for the child's welfare was accepted well by the child, while authority based on the adult's desire to dominate or exploit the child was rejected.

Local Studies on Parental Support and Control

When compared with the bulk of research work on parental support and control in the Western context, relatively less related references can be found in the local context. Yet some studies are worth mentioning as a guide to the family scene in Hong Kong.

The study on social causes of juvenile delinquency by Agnes Ng (1975) highlights the important role of parental control and supervision in influencing adolescents' behaviour. The findings suggest that the relationship between young offenders and their parents were less favourable than the non-offenders. Both parental support and control of the delinquent group is weaker than the non-delinquent group. The offenders communicated less freely with their parents and were less inclined to consult their parents when they are faced with various problems.

A descriptive study by the Hong Kong Young Women Christian Association and Shue Yan College (1981) on the daily activities of working mothers with pre-school age children summarizes several characteristics of maternal control of the clerical group and manual group in contrast to the professional group. The professional group uses verbal praises and reasoning more frequently than the other two groups. The use of material reward is more common in the clerical and manual group. The professional group emphasizes on the more rational and educational approach.

The study on family life education by Daniel Chan Fook Kwan (1981) suggests that local parental control is rather punitive in nature. The mothers rely on scolding and spanking in child discipline. Paternal support is rather inadequate. (Very little emphasis is placed on understanding the psychosocial needs of the children and the importance of parental support in helping the children to grow up with confidence and self-respect.

However, the study by M.C. Lam (1982) on the changing patterns of child rearing in low-income families has different findings. It highlights that parental control has shifted its emphasis from physical punishment to reasoning. Parents of urban low-income families are getting more liberal and understanding towards their children.

A more recent and related survey study conducted by the Boy's and Girl's Clubs Association of Hong Kong (1983) is on parenthood in contemporary Hong Kong focusing on the experience of mothers. On the area of control and discipline, the findings highlight that half of the sample resort to the use of punishment when children misbehave. About one-third of the sample turns to positive inducement such as reasoning, persuasion, explaining, in getting the child to comply. Some respondents however, found no workable means to cope with their children. Corporal punishment is used quite frequently even though they do not approve it. The majority consider positive inducement as more viable alternative than corporal punishment.

As seen from above, the studies on parental control are rather exploratory and descriptive in nature which sketch out some characteristics of child-rearing practices. There is so far no study directly done on the effect of parental support and control on children's behaviour. To conclude, maybe some insight can be drawn from the research on secondary school student's moral judgement conducted by St. James Settlement (1981). The research results reveal the close connection between parent-child relationship and the youth's other social relationships as well as moral judgement. It is imperative that the parents be sensitized or educated about the essential elements of parenting - such as the appropriate communication

skills with their children, the willingness to offer their time and real concern for their children and the provision of good personal examples to their children so as to facilitate the appropriate identification of their children with them. In other words, parental support and control are called forth.

From the above literature review, it is seen that parental support and control are two important dimensions of parental behaviour and they bear significant influences over a child's behaviour. Firm parental control when coupled with parental warmth will promote the development of social responsibility and self-control in children. Self-control is a pre-requisite of compliant behaviour in children. So inadequate parental support and ineffective parental control are more likely to correlate with non-compliant behaviours in children.

Footnotes

1. Darwin L. Thomas, Victor Gecas, Andrew J. Weigert and Elizabeth A. Rooney, Family Socialization and the Adolescent (Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Co., 1974, pp. 10-11).
2. Diana Baumrind, "Current Patterns of Parental Authority", Developmental Psychology Monographs, 1971, p. 87.

CHAPTER 111

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A Child's Basic Needs and Parental Support and Control

According to Charlotte Towle (1965), the most basic impulse in any organism is the impulse to survive. The need to feel secure is fundamental. There are three sources of security that enable a child to feel safe and to experience a satisfying relationship with others - consistent physical care and conditions conducive to good health requisite to a feeling of well-being, uninterrupted opportunity to learn, and reassuring encouragement to persist in learning through sympathetic attention to his hurts when his first learning efforts endanger his safety and also relationships in which he is loved. For the central issue of the child's life, the wish to be loved and to be cared for, the noteworthy point is that he must have love as well as care in order to feel secure and to develop a socialized self. Children with inadequate parental love, remain unsatisfied and insecure and manifest their resultant anxiety in behaviour disturbances of varied sorts. Commonly encountered in these situations is a restless, demanding, attention-seeking child. (Towle, 1965 pp.50-54).

Philip Pinkerton (1974), a lecturer in Paediatric Psychiatry in the University of Liverpool also points out some basic developmental needs of children which are paramount for healthy emotional development and failure to provide them may give rise to reactive symptom formation. The most fundamental of these is love, not in any sentimental sense, but as

a basic biological need to be cherished by parents in a sustained and ideally undemanding relationship. But love alone is not enough. Coupled with it is an universal need for personal identity - to be loved for the child's own sake, with all his shortcomings, rather than as someone his parents might want him to be. There is a need for belonging, in his own right, within a family which cares about him, supports him and feels genuine interest in his personal affairs. Furthermore, a child needs a scope for self-expression in the physical, intellectual and emotional aspects. The child is a dynamo of energy with a very real physical need from time to time, to let off his energy. In exactly the same way, his developing mind needs constant stimulus to expand and explore the new and exciting world of fresh impressions unfolding all around him. Emotionally, there must be an outlet for personal feelings and a child with good parental support may have these needs satisfied. Lastly, a child needs parental guidance because unrestricted freedom of action will lead to insecurity. Some balancing code of parental control is called for, but it must be firm, reasonable and consistent. (Pinkerton, 1974, pp.38-41).

In practice, no home can hope to measure up to these criteria without the occasional lapse. After all, parents and their children are only human. However, if parental support and control are lacking over a long period of time, the child's personal security could be threatened and problem arises. Symptoms of non-compliance are likely to occur in both home and school setting.

Approaches Explaining a Child's Non-compliant Behaviour

Biological Approach

The first approach explains children's behaviour from a biological standpoint. Such a theory disregards the socio-cultural impact on individual behaviour, but seeks to explain how individual differences in genetic make-up, central nervous system functioning, organic constellation and temperamental factors affect a child's behaviour. This perspective is not strongly supported by scientific research findings. For example, the study by Paine, Werry and Quay (1968) shows no correlation between conduct problem and organic indicators.

Developmental Lag Model

The second approach explains behaviour problems in terms of children's developmental delay or physical abnormality. According to Pinkerton (1974), anything which curtails physical "wholesomeness" may adversely affect the child's capacity to cope with his surrounding world. To what extent this applies will obviously depend upon the nature of the handicap. Interference with the child's perception of the world around him is bound to undermine his self-sufficiency and affect his behaviour, for example blindness, partial sight and deafness. Locomotor problems such as cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy or orthopaedic disorder will be denied freedom to explore his personal environment because of restricted mobility. As a result, his life experiences will be limited. However in this study, the target groups comprised of physically normal children and such an approach is not appropriate in explaining a child's non-compliance.

Psychoanalytic Approach

According to the Freudian or classical psychoanalytic theory, human behaviour is impelled largely by self-gratifying motives. Instinctual drives and guilt are major determinants of behaviour, including social conscience, justice and normal behaviour. So the psychoanalytic approach explains a child's non-compliant behaviour from an intrapsychic point of view. As Gelfand (1969) explains, a widespread belief in the past was that children's non-compliant behaviours originated in underlying mental conflict states such as insecurity, unresolved oedipal conflicts or repressed hostility. Unconscious thoughts and feelings were thought to result in a wide variety of specific behavioural systems. Its emphasis on parental prohibitions through identification has sensitized our understanding of parental influence on children's behaviour. (Mussen, 1977). However, because of its focus on the self-seeking aspect of human behaviour, its perspective is rather narrow. Also, the psychoanalytic approach is rather pathological and passive in nature. It explains a child's non-compliance solely in terms of underlying conflicts. Therapy is the preserve of trained psychotherapists, who usually treat the parents and/or child for supposed disturbances. Parents and teachers play a minimal part in modifying the child's behaviour.

Family Interaction Approach

A child's non-compliant behaviour may reflect disturbed interaction between child and environment, particularly relating to the significant adults such as parents. As

Satir (1965, p. 23) mentions, the symptom of any family member at a given time is seen as a comment on a dysfunctional family system. The child's non-compliant behaviour is seen as a signal that there is some trouble in the family system, especially in the parental subsystem, as Minuchin (1974 p. 97) calls it. In an ideal parental subsystem, parents are expected to understand children's developmental needs and to explain the rules they impose with flexible, rational authority. However, if the parental subsystem is malfunctioning, parents will lack the capacity to nurture, guide and control their children. As a result, the latter's attitude and behaviour will be affected. Factors influencing the malfunctioning of the parental subsystem are rather complex such as marital discord, faulty parental expectation and dissatisfactory parent-child relationship. So, in the family interaction approach, a child's pattern of non-compliant behaviour is seen as a result of his parents' malfunctioning of support and control in the parental subsystem.

Social Learning Approach

In social learning approach, social scientists tend not to view non-compliant behaviour exclusively in terms of hypothesized mental conflicts but interpret both compliant and non-compliant behaviour as products of social learning experiences. It is a resultant of a complex transaction between the individual with his inborn strengths and weakness, acting and reacting within an environment which sometimes encourages and sometimes discourages his behaviour. Children with non-compliant behaviours demonstrate a fundamental inability

or unwillingness to adhere to the rules and codes of conduct prescribed by society at its various levels. (Herbert, 1978, p. 26). Such failures may be related to the temporary lapse of poorly established learned controls, to the failure to learn these controls in the first place, or to the fact that the behavioural standards a child has absorbed do not coincide with the norms of that section of society which enacts and enforces the rules. So the behavioural approach emphasizes on manipulation of the immediate environment in modifying the child's behaviour. Treatment is not only about changing the undesirable behaviour of the child, it is also about altering the behaviour of the parents, teachers and others who form a significant part of the child's social world.

In the social learning framework, the development of compliance in young children is an important aspect of socialization. Piaget (1932) defines the essential core of morality as the tendency to accept and follow a system of rules which regulate interpersonal behaviour. The induction of the child into the social system (socialization) involves the transmission to him of social and moral codes by the family and other agents of society. For the child it involves incredibly subtle and complex processes of learning. Learning occurs within a social nexus: rewards, punishments mediated by human agents and within attachment systems.

Learning theorists e.g. Eysenck (1960), Hoffman (1970) and Mowrer (1960) base their investigations of conscience development upon the assumption that there is nothing about moral learning to distinguish it qualitatively from other forms of learning. A child acquires, through learning and

identification, both the content of his parents' moral code and a willingness to act in accordance with the rules. Stayton, Hogan and Ainsworth (1971) points out that usually no distinction is made between the process of learning the rules of society and that first and most important step is the socialization of the child, which occurs when he develops a willingness to do as he is told. What he learns will depend on the nature of the parents' demands, but the development of an initial disposition with it, regarding its rules and values from an external point of view.¹ The family, like other socializing agents of society make use of various techniques other than physical and psychological rewards and punishments to teach and control the child in its care. Among those used are direct instructions, setting an example and providing explanation of rules.

Social learning theorists view the family as being particularly significant in the child's social and moral development because it is the first and most potent agent, deciding which social stimuli he is exposed to and what he is taught. It determines the categories of behaviour which are defined as "good", and therefore rewarded and encouraged, and those which are labelled "bad", and therefore punished and suppressed. Positive experiences, in particular, gradually give shape and substance to the pro-social patterns of behaviour with which they are associated, and the more often these experiences are repeated the more enduring the responses become.² When the family fails in providing appropriate and consistent socialization experiences, the child is particularly vulnerable to the development of conduct and delinquent disorders.

This is reflected in empirical studies. (Farrington and West, 1971; Knight and West, 1975). Typically, the children with persistent disorders come from families where there is inconsistent, ineffective and either extremely severe or lax discipline.

To summarize, the biological approach and the developmental lag approach explain a child's non-compliant behaviour from an endogenous perspective. A child's given genetic endowment and physical attributes are inborn and a scientific enquiry into the relationship between biological factors and behaviour problems is very complicated. On the other hand, the psychoanalytic approach is criticized for its emphasis on a child's unresolved conflicts and repressed hostilities in accounting for non-compliant behaviour. Such a perspective is rather pathological in nature because it is associated with the child's shame and guilt.

Since the utmost concern of this study is how a child's behaviour is influenced by his parents, a more developmental approach such as the family interaction model and social learning model is adopted.

In Hong Kong, the new-born babies' mortality rate is very low (according to the Census and Statistics of 1972, 11.7 out of 1,000 new-born babies died in 1972). The Maternity and Children Health Centre run by the Medical and Health Department provides pre-natal and post-natal service as well as immunization, vaccination, assessment and guidance to children up to the age of five years old. This service is open to all classes of people and in fact, most beneficiaries are within the lower income group because the service is free of charge.

So it is quite obvious that most babies and pre-school children are very healthy and normal in the beginning. With the introduction of nine years' compulsory education in Hong Kong in 1970's, all children are provided with good educational opportunities. Given equal physical growth and education opportunities and with similar socio-economic level and housing condition, why is it that some children's behaviour are more likely to become non-compliant than the others? It is argued that parental influence is the most dominant factor in affecting children's behaviour. So in this study, the family interaction approach and the social learning approach are used to explain the child's non-compliant behaviour. That is, a child's behaviour problem is a result of parent's inability to nurture, guide and control their children. It is also a reflection of ineffective socialization and inadequate discipline of the family.

Footnotes

1. Martin Herbert, Conduct Disorders of Childhood and Adolescence, a Behavioural Approach to Assessment and Treatment (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978), p. 28.
2. Ibid., p. 11.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Hypotheses And Definitions

Hypotheses

There are altogether three major hypotheses in the present study.

Hypothesis I

There is an inverse relationship between parental support and children's non-compliance. That is, the more non-compliant the child is in the school setting, the lower parental support he is receiving.

Hypothesis II

There is an inverse relationship between parental control and children's non-compliance. That is, the more non-compliant the child is in the school setting, the lower parental control he is receiving.

Hypothesis III

There is significant difference in the aspects of support and control between the mothers of the compliant group and the mothers of the non-compliant group with similar socio-economic level and housing condition.

III (a) - The parental support of the non-compliant group is lower than that of the compliant group.

III (b) - The parental control of the non-compliant group is lower than that of the compliant group.

Conceptual Definition of Variables

Support

This refers to that quality of the interaction which the mother initiates the child, establishing a positive, affective relationship with him. (Straus 1967, p.9-10).

Control Techniques

Control techniques refer to firm enforcement of rules, effective resistance to the child's coercive demands, and the mother's willingness to guide the child by structured interventions. (Baumrind 1971, p.87).

Non-compliance

This refers to the acts of a child which are committed consecutively in the school setting and disapproved by his school. Non-compliance in this study will confine only to conduct problems of the child in the school setting.

Operational Definition of Variables

Parents - As compared to the husband, the wife is more active in assuming the major care-taking role of children in the lower socio-economic level because of the husband's long working hours as well as the traditional division of labour. The wife is usually more involved in the supportive and disciplinary activities of the children. So in this study, "parents" refer to those mothers with children studying Primary One to Three in the schools participating in this study in Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping area. Both natural and adoptive mothers who are living with the child and assuming the guardian and care-taker role are included.

Children - This refers to those boys and girls who are studying in either Primary One, Two or Three in the schools participating in this study in Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping area.

Support - In the last three decades, researchers have created a number of instruments and techniques to tap the supportive dimensions of parental behaviour. Three of the more widely used are the "Parental-Child Interaction Rating Scale" (Heilbrun, 1964, 1973); the "Cornell Parent Behaviour Description" (Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Devereus, Bronfenbrenner, and Rodgers, 1969); and the "Parent Behaviour Inventory" (Schaefer, 1965).¹ These three have been used by multiple research designs and appear worthy of further analysis. Among these three scales, the five items of "security", "trust", "affection", "approval", and "interest" from the Heilbrun scale of support appear to be fairly safe choices for inclusion in any project designed to measure general parental support (Ellis and Rollins 1976, p.718-721). As there is no established index of parental support in Hong Kong, the index is developed in this study on an exploratory basis. So in the present study, based on these five dimensions, parental support is operationalized by the following twenty items.

Security:

1. Teach the child in a warm tone.

2. Beware of the child's needs and reacts appropriately.
3. Beware of the child's happy moods and unhappy moods.
4. Comfort the child if he/she is unhappy and cries and pacifies his/her emotions.
5. Be able to forgive and comfort the child after each disciplinary action.
6. Arrange an adult to look after the child when the mother has to go out.

Trust:

7. Encourage the child to solve his own problem.
8. Believe that the child has the ability to change for better after committing a mistake and admitting he/she is wrong.

Affection:

9. Spend some time to talk with the child everyday.
10. Touch and kisses the child to show affection.
11. Let the child have his/her own choice when mother intends to buy something for him/her.
12. Try to spend time with the child and plays with him/her.
13. Remember the child's birthday and present a small gift to him/her.

Approval:

14. Praise the child when his/her behaviour is good.
15. Feel that the child is lovely and is proud of him/her.
16. Appreciate the child's uniqueness and will not compare him/her to other children.

Interest:

17. Know his/her classmates/friend's name.
18. Supervise him/her in doing homework.
19. Check his/her school handbook.
20. Listen to the child's words patiently.

Parental support will be measured on a high-low continuum. The instrument for measurement will be a 5-point summated score ranging from very frequently (5), frequently (4), sometimes (3), seldom (2) to never (1). There are twenty items measuring parental support as listed in Part B - Number 1 to 20 of the questionnaire (Please refer to Appendix III). In each item, 5 scores stand for highest support and 1 score stands for lowest support. As there are twenty items, 100 scores stand for the summated highest parental support. As Chinese parents emphasize quite a lot on parent-child relationship, the cutting point between high and low parental support is suggested to be above 60. Statistically, since the group mean of parental support (N=240) is 60.8, 61 is used as the cutting point. Parental support is considered high if the mother's total score exceeds 61 and parental support is considered low if the total score is under 61.

Operational Definition of Control Technique

There is a substantial agreement (Wright, 1971) about the conditions conducive to the acquisition of internalized rule formation or dimensions of parental control techniques. These include firm moral demands made by parents upon children, the consistent use of sanctions, techniques of punishment that are psychological rather than physical, appropriate use of

reward and punishment, techniques of rewards that are non-material rather material and an intensive use of reasoning and explanation. As there is no established index of parental control in Hong Kong, the index is developed in this study on an exploratory basis. So here, based on the abovementioned dimensions, parental control techniques are operationalized by the following twenty items:

1. Tell the child that you are displeased when he/she misbehaves.
2. Use reasoning instead of physical punishment when the child misbehaves.
3. Explain the consequences of the behaviour to the child after punishment.
4. Warn the child before punishment.
5. Take reasoning as the most effective control technique.
6. Take physical punishment as the last resort of control.
7. Request the child's participation in household chores as appropriate to the child's ability.
8. Use clear directives in rule enforcement.
9. Focus on the act itself if the child misbehaves instead of blaming all his/her defects.
10. Praise the child verbally when he/she is good.
11. Reward the child by material thing when he/she is good.
12. Reward the child by an activity when he/she is good.
13. Use verbal praises more frequently when the child is good.
14. Regard verbal praise as the most effective reward.
15. Repeat teaching the child when he/she misbehaves.
16. Respect obedience as a salient positive value.
17. Be rational when exercising disciplinary techniques - the ultimate goal is to help the child develop a good personality.

18. Punish the child immediately after the undesirable act.
19. Discipline the child in a private environment.
20. Be firm in rule enforcement - not to change mind even if the child reacts strongly in the form of temper tantrums.

Parental control techniques will be measured on a high-low continuum. The instrument for measurement will be a 5-point summated score ranging from very frequently (5), frequently (4), sometimes (3), seldom (2) to never (1). There are twenty items measuring parental control techniques as listed in Part C - Number 1 to 20 of the questionnaire (Please refer to Appendix III). In each item, 5 scores stand for highest control and 1 score stands for lowest control. As there are twenty items, 100 scores stand for the summated highest parental control. As Chinese parents emphasize quite a lot on child discipline, the cutting point between high and low parental support is suggested to be over 60. Statistically, since the group mean of parental control (N=240) is 66.8, 67 is used as the cutting point. Parental control is considered high if the mother's total score exceeds 67 and parental control is considered low if the mother's total score is below 67.

Operational Definition of Non-Compliance

Since there is no established non-compliance scale in Hong Kong, an index measuring this concept is developed on an exploratory basis. Discussions were held with teachers, principals on the operational definition of non-compliance in the school setting. This will be mentioned in details later (on the part of reliability and validity). The concept of non-compliance are concretized by 16 items:

1. Talking with other classmates during lessons.
2. Leave of seat during lessons.
3. Unattentiveness during lessons.
4. Playing during lessons.
5. Answering back to teachers.
6. Destroying school properties.
7. Using other classmates' properties without permission.
8. Speaking rough languages in school.
9. Does not hand in assignments.
10. Does not complete assignments.
11. Does not write up hand-books.
12. Doing assignments untidily.
13. Bullying other classmates.
14. Quarrelling with other classmates.
15. Fighting with other classmates.
16. Running and clashing with other classmates during recess time.

The above 16 items are used to assess the child's non-compliant behaviour listed in the questionnaire of children's non-compliance in the school setting (Please refer to Appendix I). It is rated by a 4-point summated score - frequently (4), sometimes (3), seldom (2), and never (1). Students with summed scores of 64 to 40 will be chosen as the non-compliant group (Statistically, the group mean of the non-compliant group with N=120 is 48.55). Students with summed scores of 16 to 25 will be chosen as the compliant group (Statistically, the group mean of the compliant group is 18).

Design And Method

The research study aims at discovering whether there are differences between the two groups, the mothers of compliant children and the mothers of non-compliant children, in the aspects of support and control techniques. A two group comparison was adopted. The selection process is two phased. First, the compliant group and non-compliant group of children

are identified. Then the mothers of these two different groups of children will be compared.

In order to isolate some of the factors which may be found to be extraneous to the result of the study, some factors were controlled.

- (1) Housing type : Since the living standards, income, socio-economic status and life-style in general varies from one type of housing to another, it is important to control the type of housing in order to permit a comparison under the same living conditions.
- (2) Marital Status : The mothers of the compliant and non-compliant group are married and living with their husbands. The separated, divorced, widowed mothers are excluded. Since children from single-parent or broken families are more stressful than children from normal families, it is important to control the marital status of the two groups of mothers in order to permit a comparison under the same family situation.
- (3) Parents living with children:
The mothers selected for this study must be living with children and assuming an active guardian and care-taking role. Since children not living with their

parents will be exposed to the influence of other adults, it is important to control this factor in order to permit a comparison with same parent-child proximity.

(4) Children's education level:

Both the compliant and non-compliant group of children are studying in Primary One to Primary Three. They are still under the dominant influence of their parents especially mothers. Since children of senior classes will be more exposed to peer influences, it is important to control this factor in order to permit a comparison within the same junior classes.

Selecting a locale for survey

Since this study aims at comparing parental support and control techniques of two groups of mother of the same lower socio-economic strata and housing conditions, Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping Estates are chosen as my locale of study. As explained earlier in this thesis, Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping are two large low-income urban estates with old-fashioned designs and white-washed by the process of urbanization. Under similar stressful living conditions with low-income level, why is it that children of some families are more compliant while children of others are more non-compliant? It is within these two large low-income urban estates that the study is carried out.

Universe of the study

Since this study aims at comparing parental support and control between the mothers of compliant and non-compliant children in the school setting, the two groups of students must be selected first. At the initial stage, all 31 registered primary schools in Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping are invited formally by letter to participate in this study. Finally only 14 schools showed interest in supporting this research. These 14 schools are:

1. Sau Mau Ping Catholic Primary School (a.m. session).
2. Sau Mau Ping Catholic Primary School (p.m. session).
3. The Hong Kong Wong Clan Association Primary School (a.m. session).
4. The Hong Kong Wong Clan Association Primary School (p.m. session).
5. Sun Kei Primary School (a.m. session).
6. Sun Kei Primary School (p.m. session).
7. The Hong Kong Fung Clan Association School.
8. Ming Kay Primary School (a.m. session)
9. Ming Kay Primary School (p.m. session)
10. Buddhist Nei Ming Primary School.
11. Pooi Shing Primary School (a.m. session).
12. Pooi Shing Primary School (p.m. session).
13. S.K.H. Shiu Keung Primary School (a.m. session).
14. S.K.H. Shiu Keung Primary School (p.m. session).

Among these 14 primary schools, there are 1 Buddhist School, 2 Catholic schools, 3 Nil-religion schools and 8 Christian schools. The Principals' expertise advice was sought when developing the Non-compliance Index for selecting

children. They would then pass the Non-compliance Index to the teachers of Primary One to Three for choosing the compliant and non-compliant children.

There are altogether 128 classes from Primary One to Primary Three among these 14 schools. The number of students in each class ranges from 30 to 40, with a mean of 35. So the total number of students from Primary One to Primary Three is 4,480.

The distribution of classes are listed as below:

<u>School</u>	<u>No. of Classes from Primary 1 to Primary 3</u>	<u>No. of Students</u>
1. Sau Mau Ping Catholic Primary School (a.m.)	12	420
2. Sau Mau Ping Catholic Primary School (p.m.)	12	420
3. The H.K. Wong Clan Association Primary School (a.m.)	12	420
4. The H.K. Wong Clan Association Primary School (p.m.)	9	315
5. Sun Kei Primary School (a.m.)	12	420
6. Sun Kei Primary School (p.m.)	9	315
7. The H.K. Fung Clan Association Primary School	3	105
8. Ming Kay Primary School (a.m.)	11	385
9. Ming Kay Primary School (p.m.)	5	175
10. Buddhist Nei Ning Primary School	3	105
11. Pooi Shing Primary School (a.m.)	12	420
12. Pooi Shing Primary School (p.m.)	4	140
13. S.K.H. Shiu Keung Primary School (a.m.)	12	420
14. S.K.H. Shiu Keung Primary School (p.m.)	12	420

Sampling

Selection of non-compliant students

A stratified random sampling method was used in this study. The 14 schools who supported this study represented 14 units. In each school, the class teachers were requested to choose non-compliant students based on the Non-compliance Index. Students with a summed score of 40 or over were identified as the non-compliant group. (They must be living with both parents and preferably residing in Lam Tin or Sau Mau Ping area). In this way, a total of 220 non-compliance cases was chosen by the class teachers of the 14 schools. Within each school, a random number was assigned to each non-compliance case. As the expected sample size is 120 and 12 cases would be reserved as spare samples to replace inaccessible cases, 60% of the total number of cases in each school would be drawn making a total of 132 cases.

A distribution of cases was listed as below:

<u>School</u>	<u>No. of students with score 40 and/or over</u>	<u>Students drawn after Random method</u>
1. Sau Mau Ping Catholic Primary School (a.m.)	18	11
2. Sau Mau Ping Catholic Primary School (p.m.)	12	7
3. The H.K. Wong Clan Association Primary School (a.m.)	16	10
4. The H.K. Wong Clan Association Primary School (p.m.)	16	10
5. Sun Kei Primary School (a.m.)	19	11
6. Sun Kei Primary School (p.m.)	18	11
7. The H.K. Fung Clan Association Primary School	7	4

<u>School</u>	<u>No.of students with score 40 and/or over</u>	<u>Students drawn after Random method</u>
8. Ming Kay Primary School (a.m.)	16	10
9. Ming Kay Primary School (p.m.)	10	6
10. Buddhist Nei Ming Primary School	9	5
11. Pooi Shing Primary School (a.m.)	21	13
12. Pooi Shing Primary School (p.m.)	13	8
13. S.K.H. Shiu Keung Primary School (a.m.)	29	16
14. S.K.H. Shiu Keung Primary School (p.m.)	16	10
<hr/>		
T O T A L	220	132

Selection of Compliant Students

Among the 14 schools, the class teachers were requested to choose compliant students based on the Non-compliance Index. Students with a summed score of 25 or under were identified as the compliant group. (They must be living with both parents and preferrably residing in Lam Tin or Sau Mau Ping area). In this way, a total of 330 compliant students was chosen by the class-teachers of the 14 schools. Within each school, a random number was assigned to each compliant case. Since this study is a two group comparison, the number of compliant students has to match with the non-compliant students within each school. So an adjusted proportion of cases was drawn randomly from each school, making a total of 132 cases (the expected sample size is 120 and 12 cases will serve as spare samples to replace unaccessible cases). A distribution of cases was listed as below:

<u>School</u>	<u>No. of students with scores 25 and/or below</u>	<u>No. of students drawn after simple random method</u>
1. Sau Mau Ping Catholic Primary School (a.m.)	33	11
2. Sau Mau Ping Catholic Primary School (p.m.)	35	7
3. The H.K. Wong Clan Association Primary School (a.m.)	26	10
4. The H.K. Wong Clan Association Primary School (p.m.)	15	10
5. Sun Kei Primary School (a.m.)	27	11
6. Sun Kei Primary School (p.m.)	23	11
7. The H.K. Fung Clan Association Primary School	7	4
8. Ming Kay Primary School (a.m.)	33	10
9. Ming Kay Primary School (p.m.)	12	6
10. Buddhist Nei Ming Primary School	10	5
11. Pooi Shing Primary School (a.m.)	31	13
12. Pooi Shing Primary School (p.m.)	21	8
13. S.K.H. Shiu Keung Primary School (a.m.)	29	16
14. S.K.H. Shiu Keung Primary School (p.m.)	31	10
T O T A L	330	132

Interviews with Mothers

The mothers of the 120 non-compliant children will be interviewed accordingly. The mothers of the 120 compliant children will be interviewed accordingly. The response rate from the two groups of mothers is very satisfactory. All 240 mothers were interviewed - 120 mothers of the compliant group and 120 mothers of the non-compliant group.

Instrument for Measurement

Children's Non-compliance Index

The 16 items are used to assess the child's non-compliant behaviour listed in the questionnaire of children's non-compliance in the school setting (Please refer to Appendix II). It is rated by a 4-point summated score - frequently (4), sometimes (3), seldom (2) and never (1). Pupils with summed scores of 64 to 40 will be chosen as the non-compliant group (Statistically, the group mean of the non-compliant group with $N=120$ is 48.55). Pupils with summed scores of 16 to 25 will be chosen as the compliant group (Statistically, the group mean of the compliant group is 18).

Reliability: The Alpha Coefficient for the Non-compliance Index is 0.97 ($N=240$) indicating a high level of internal consistency among the 16 items.

Validity: Since there is no established index in children's non-compliance in Hong Kong, the Index used in this study is developed on an exploratory basis. Reference References are borrowed from an article on student discipline - "The Student

Teacher and Discipline Problems" by Lian-Hwang Chiu (1975-76, p.69-72).² In order to represent the students' non-compliance in Hong Kong, the opinions of teachers, student counsellors and Principals are sought on the criteria for measuring non-compliance. Finally, a drafted Index of Non-compliance was compiled in December, 1983. This drafted index was then passed to the 14 Principals who participated in this study for further comments. All of them rated the Index as very representative of the student's degree of non-compliance and agreed that students with a summed score of 40 and/or over are non-compliant and students with a summed score of 25 and/or under are compliant. In this way, face validity is ensured.

Furthermore, internal validity is ensured by cross-checking the school's number of disciplinary actions taken towards the student (please refer to Appendix I, Part III). The more non-compliant the student, the more frequent will he be punished by the school authorities. According to a group of independent judges comprising of 5 teachers and 4 Principals, students who had received more than 12 punishments during a school term are really very non-compliant and those with less than 3 punishments are rather compliant. In this study, the mean of punishment for the compliant group (N=120) is 0.34 (i.e. less than once per school

41

term) and the mean of punishment for the non-compliant group (N=120) is 23.75 (i.e. more than 23 times per school term).

Parental Support Index

Parental support will be measured on a high-low continuum. The instrument for measurement will be a 5-point summated score ranging from very frequently (5), frequently (4), sometimes (3), seldom (2) to never (1). There are twenty items measuring parental support as listed in Part B - Number 1 to 20 of the questionnaire (Please refer to Appendix III). In each item, 5 scores stand for highest support and 1 score stands for lowest support. As there are twenty items, 100 scores stand for the summated highest parental support. As Chinese parents emphasize quite a lot on parent-child relationship, the cutting point between high and low parental support is suggested to be above 60. Statistically, since the group mean of parental support (N=240) is 60.8, 61 is used as the cutting point. Parental support is considered high if the mother's total score exceeds 61 and parental support is considered low if the total score is under 61.

Reliability: The Alpha Coefficient for the Parental Support Index is 0.94 (N=240), indicating a high level of internal consistency among the 20 items.

Validity : The construction of measurement was based on a few major sources.

The items were constructed with reference to Heilbrun's five dimensions of parental support. (1964, pp.151-167). Ellis and Rollins (1976, pp. 718-722) in their article on "Measuring Parental Support" suggested that Heilbrun's five dimensions

of parental support - "security", "trust", "affection", "approval", and "interest" are fairly safe choices for inclusion in any project designed to measure general parental support. Also, professional social workers who handle family cases and parents with children studying at Primary One to Three were consulted before and after the drawing up of the measurement concerning the validity of the questions. In this way, face validity is ensured.

Parental Control Index

Parental control techniques will be measured on a high-low continuum. The instrument for measurement will be a 5-point summated score ranging from very frequently (5), frequently (4), sometimes (3), seldom (2) to never (1). There are twenty items measuring parental control techniques as listed in Part C - Number 1 to 20 of the questionnaire. (Please refer to Appendix III). In each item, 5 scores stand for highest control and 1 score stands for lowest control. As there are twenty items, 100 scores stand for the summated highest parental control. As Chinese parents emphasize quite a lot on child discipline, the cutting point between high and low parental support is suggested to be over 60. Statistically, since the group mean of parental control (N=240) is 66.8, 67 is used as the cutting point. Parental control is considered high if the mother's total score exceeds 67 and parental control is considered low if the mother's total score is below 67.

Reliability: The Alpha Coefficient for the Parental support Index (N=240) is 0.92 which suggests a high correlation between the 20 items constituting the measurement and a satisfactory level of reliability.

Validity : The construction of the measurement was based on a few major sources. Diana Baumrind (1971, p.88) in her article on "Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behaviour" had suggested seven dimensions of parental control after reviewing 12 studies - relevant to the topic. These dimensions were used as a guide to construct items on parental control with relevance to the local context. Professional social workers and parents were consulted before and after the drawing up of the measurement concerning the validity of the questions to ensure face validity.

Pilot Test

A pilot test was arranged in February in Sau Mau Ping Catholic Primary School. 10 mothers of the compliant group and 10 mothers of the non-compliant group were randomly chosen to answer the preliminary questionnaire by personal interviews, conducted by the researcher. The objective of the pilot test was three-folded.

1. To see whether the mothers understand the content and vocabulary of the questionnaire and amendments will be made if necessary.
2. To see if there are some relevant answers suggested by the mothers and make necessary supplements.
3. To estimate the approximate time needed for each interview.

During the pilot test, the mothers were very cooperative in answering the questions. Most of them found the questions comprehensive. Some amendments were made after the pilot test in order to ensure the consistency and clarity of the questions.

The time needed for each interview ranged from thirty to sixty minutes. Such a pretest was very useful for it enabled the researcher to tailor the content of questionnaire and assess the time needed for the interviews.

Data Collection

After the pilot test, some minor amendments were made and the questionnaires were reprinted. The content of the questionnaire includes:

- A. Personal Particulars : Students' group, mother's age, duration in Hong Kong, family composition, number of children, birth order of child, mother's education, mother's career, mother's religion, housing type, total family income, father's age, father's education, father's career and father's religion. (See Appendix III, Section A).
- B. Parental Support : Measured by 20 items (See Appendix III, Section B).
- C. Parental Control Techniques : Measured by 20 items (See Appendix III, Section C).

This questionnaire was used as the instrument for measuring parental support and control techniques. Since most of the respondents are below primary level, personal interviews were used for information gathering instead of mailed questionnaires. Data collection was conducted between end of February to end of March, 1984. All the 240 mothers

were interviewed by the researcher. The interviews took place in the school by previous telephone appointments. These mothers were assured of the confidentiality of the data in order to obtain their co-operation. Each interview with a respondent lasted from thirty to forty minutes. Most respondents were rather co-operative during the interviews.

Data Analysis

All the data collected were coded. The codes were punched on IBM Cards for computer analysis. The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) was used for data processing (Nie, Hull et.al., 1975). As a first step, the frequency distributions of the responses to each of the items were calculated, and a percentage comparison would be made on the background variables.

In order to determine the presence of significant differences between the mothers of compliant children and the mothers of non-compliant children on the aspects of support and control, a t-test was used. This test determines whether there is a significant difference between the means of the two groups. The significance of difference was set at 0.05 level.

In measuring the strength and direction of association between parental support, control and children's non-compliance, since both the independent variables (parental support and control techniques) and the dependent variable (non-compliance) were measured on an interval level, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient would be employed to describe and summarize the strength and direction of association of the following pairs of variables:

- 1) Parental support with children's non-compliance.
- 2) Parental control techniques with children's non-compliance.

The values of Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient range potentially from -1(perfect negative relationship) through 0(no relationship) to +1(perfect positive relationship) indicating the direction and the strength of the association between parental support and non-compliance as well

47
as parental control techniques and non-compliance. F-test is used to determine statistical significance at 0.05 level.

In the study, the number of boys in the non-compliant group far exceeds that of the girls and vice versa in the compliant group. To clarify the doubt, the Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficients between parental support and control with child non-compliance will be computed in the male and female groups. Then a comparison will be made with the Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient between parental support, control and non-compliance in the total sample with both boys and girls. If the Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficients in the male and female group are similar to that of the combined group, this means that the relationships between parental support, control and non-compliance are not spurious.

Lastly, a typology of parental support and control will be computed to see the percentage of non-compliance and compliance among the four cells - low support-low control, low support-high control, high support-low control, and high support-high control. Such a distribution will present an overall picture about the effects of parental support and control on children's non-compliance.

Footnotes

1. Godfrey John Ellis, Darwin L. Thomas and Boyd Rollins, "Measuring Parental Support: The Interrelationship of Three Measures", Journal of Marriage and the Family, Volume 38, 1976, pp. 718 - 722.
2. L.H. CHIU, "The Student Teacher and Discipline Problems" Journal of Educational Research, Volume 69, 1975-1976, pp. 69-72.

CHAPTER V
PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

Profile of Students

In order to give a general idea of the profile of compliant and non-compliant student, the distribution of class, age and sex of both groups are compared and discussed as follows:

Class

The distribution of classes between the compliant group and non-compliant group is quite even and similar.

Table V-1 : Class of Students

Class	Compliant students		Non-compliant Students	
	N	%	N	%
Primary One	35	(29.2)	36	(30.0)
Primary Two	41	(34.2)	44	(36.7)
Primary Three	44	(36.7)	40	(33.3)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

Age

On the whole, the age of the non-compliant children are older than the compliant children. In the compliant group, only 19.2% are nine years of age. However, in the non-compliant group, there is 21.7% at nine years of age and 11.7% over nine years of age. This is perhaps due to the fact that the non-compliant children are weaker in academic performance and some of them had repeated for one academic year.

Table V-2 : Age of Students

Year of Age	Compliant Students		Non-compliant Students	
	N	%	N	%
Six or Under	22	(18.3)	16	(13.3)
Seven	34	(28.3)	41	(34.2)
Eight	41	(34.2)	23	(19.2)
Nine	23	(19.2)	26	(21.7)
Ten	0	(0.0)	11	(9.2)
Eleven	0	(0.0)	2	(1.7)
Twelve or Over	0	(0.0)	1	(0.8)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

Sex

From the distribution listed below, it seems that the sex distribution is rather uneven. In the compliant group, 33.9% belongs to boys and 66.1% belongs to girls. In the non-compliant group, 89.1% are boys and 10.9% are girls. Such a distribution will lead us to think about the effect of sex on children's non-compliance. To clarify the doubts, a comparison will be made with the Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient between parental support, control and non-compliance in the total sample with that in the male and female group. (Please refer to Chapter VII).

Table V-3 : Sex of Students

Sex	Compliant	Compliant Students		Non-compliant Students	
		N	%	N	%
Male		40	(33.9)	106	(89.1)
Female		78	(66.1)	13	(10.9)
Total		118	(100.0)	119	(100.0)

Number of missing observations = 3

PROFILE OF MOTHERS

In order to give a general idea of the profile of the mothers of compliant children and mothers of non-compliant children, the distribution of some personal particulars will be compared and discussed as below.

Age of Mothers

The age distribution of mothers in both the compliant group and the non-compliant group is in the 31-40 age range and 41-50 age range. This shows that the mothers of both groups are not too young and they may be rather traditional in the aspects of parental support and control.

Table V-4 : Age of Mothers

Age of Mothers	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
21 - 30	13	(10.8)	17	(14.2)
31 - 40	73	(60.8)	73	(60.8)
41 - 50	29	(24.2)	24	(20.0)
51 - 60	5	(4.2)	6	(5.0)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

Mothers' stay in Hong Kong

The distribution of mothers' stay in Hong Kong between the two groups is rather similar. Most of them have been staying in Hong Kong for over 10 years. About one-third of them are born in Hong Kong. This shows that most of the mothers are Hong Kong citizens and very few mothers are new arrivals.

Table V-5 : Years of Stay in Hong Kong

Years of Stay In Hong Kong	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Hong Kong Born	41	(34.2)	39	(39.5)
Less than 1 year	0	(0.0)	1	(0.8)
1 - 4 years	4	(3.3)	1	(0.8)
5 - 9 years	4	(3.3)	11	(9.2)
10 years of over	71	(59.2)	68	(56.7)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

Mothers' Education

The educational level of the two mother groups is quite similar, only that the educational level of the compliant group is slightly higher than the non-compliant group. It is quite obvious that the mothers of both groups have a rather low education level. In the compliant group, about 31% of the mothers are illiterate while in the non-compliant group, about 40% of the mothers are illiterate. In both groups, about 50% of the mothers have just received primary education. Only 10.8% of the mothers of the non-compliant group had received secondary education.

Table V-6 : Mothers' Education

Mother's Education	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Illiteracy	37	(30.8)	47	(39.2)
Primary Education	62	(51.7)	60	(50.0)
Secondary Education	21	(17.5)	13	(10.8)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

Fathers' Education

The educational level of the fathers of the compliant and non-compliant group is slightly higher than the mothers' group. But it is still quite low. Most of them have just attained primary education. Illiteracy of the fathers still exists - 21.7% in the compliant group and 28.3% in the non-compliant group. Only 28.3% of both groups of the fathers have reached secondary level.

Table V-7 : Fathers' Education

Fathers' Education	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Illiteracy	26	(21.7)	34	(28.3)
Primary Education	59	(49.2)	52	(43.3)
Secondary Education	34	(28.3)	34	(28.3)
Post-Secondary Education	1	(0.8)	0	(0.0)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

Mothers' Work

In the compliant group, a higher percentage (62.5%) of mothers stay home as housewives than the non-compliant group (46.7%). However, even in the non-compliant group, about half of the mothers are housewives and only 27.5% take up full-time work.

Table V-8 : Mothers' Work

Mothers' Work	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Full-time	20	(16.7)	33	(27.5)
Part-time	25	(20.8)	31	(25.8)
Housewife	75	(62.5)	56	(46.7)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

Mothers' Occupation

In the compliant group, 80.4% of the working mothers are semi-skilled workers. In the non-compliant group, 57.1% of the working mothers are semi-skilled workers while 15.9% are hawkers.

Table V-9 : Mothers' Occupation

Mothers' Occupation	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Clerical Workers	1	(2.2)	0	(0.0)
Service Workers	2	(4.3)	9	(14.3)
Skilled Workers	1	(2.2)	3	(4.8)
Semi-skilled Workers	37	(80.4)	36	(57.1)
Self-employed	2	(4.3)	3	(4.8)
Hawkers	2	(4.3)	10	(15.9)
Others	1	(2.2)	2	(3.2)
Total	46	(100.0) (100.0)	63	63 (100.0) (100.0)

Fathers' Occupation

The distribution of the fathers' occupation is quite similar. In both the compliant and non-compliant groups, most of the fathers are service workers, skilled workers and semi-skilled worker.

Table V-10 : Fathers' Occupation

Fathers' Occupation	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Administrative Worker	1	(0.9)	0	(0.0)
Clerical Worker	2	(1.7)	1	(0.9)
Service Worker	36	(30.8)	30	(26.1)
Skilled Worker	31	(26.5)	31	(27.0)
Semi-skilled Worker	31	(26.5)	34	(29.6)
Self-employed	9	(7.7)	8	(7.0)
Hawkers	5	(4.3)	3	(2.6)
Others	2	(1.7)	0	(0.0)
Total	117	(100.0)	115	(100.0)

599

Mothers' Working Hours

The working hours of the compliant group of mothers are slightly shorter than the non-compliant group of mothers. In the compliant group, only 13.1% work for 9-12 hours or over. In the non-compliant group, 23.8% work for 9-12 hours or over.

Table V-11 : Mothers' Working Hours

Mothers' Working Hours	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
1 - 4 Hours	20	(43.5)	17	(27.0)
5 - 8 Hours	20	(43.5)	31	(49.2)
9 - 12 Hours	5	(10.9)	12	(19.0)
12 Hours or Over	1	(2.2)	3	(4.8)
Total	46	(100.0)	63	(100.0)

Fathers' Working Hours

The fathers of both groups of children have long working hours. Over half of them work from 9 - 12 hours a day (59.8% in the compliant group and 61.7% in the non-compliant group). This seems to indicate that both groups, belong to the lower socio-economic class with the chief bread-winner working for long hours each day outside the family.

Table V-12 : Fathers' Working Hours

Fathers' Working Hours	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
5 - 8 Hours	44	(37.6)	39	(33.9)
9 - 12 Hours	70	(59.8)	71	(61.7)
12 Hours or Over	3	(2.6)	5	(4.3)
Total	117	(100.0)	115	(100.0)

Number of Missing Cases = 8

Family Income

Financially, the compliant group is more well-off than the non-compliant group. In the non-compliant group, 46.6% has a family income of less than \$3,000 per month while in the compliant group, it is only 29.2%. However the income level of both groups is quite low - only 13.3% of the compliant group has a monthly income of \$5,000 or over and it is only 9.2%.

Table V-13 : Family Income

Family Income per moth	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Less Than \$1,000	0	(0.0)	1	(0.8)
\$1,000 - 1,999	2	(1.7)	16	(13.3)
\$2,000 - 2,999	33	(27.5)	39	(32.5)
\$3,000 - 3,999	50	(41.7)	36	(30.0)
\$4,000 - 4,999	19	(15.8)	17	(14.2)
\$5,000 - 5,999	7	(5.8)	6	(5.0)
\$6,000 or Over	9	(7.5)	5	(4.2)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

Housing Type

A great majority of both groups of mothers live in public housing units and such housing type is one of the indicators of low socio-economic status in Hong Kong. None of the respondents live in private tenements.

Table V-14 : Housing Type

Housing Type	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Public Housing	117	(97.5)	115	(95.8)
Private Housing	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
Temporary Housing Squatter hut and Village House	3	(2.5)	5	(4.2)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

Living Area of Respondents

Though this study aims at comparing parental support and control of mothers living in Lam Tin or Sau Mau Ping Estate, due to the reason that these two estates have a history of more than ten years, there is a lack of school-age children in some schools especially in junior classes. However over 80% of the respondents reside in Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping area and these two estates are still the subject area of the study.

Table V-15 : Living Area of Respondents

Living Area	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Lam Tin Estate	50	(41.7)	49	(40.8)
Sau Mau Ping Estate	58	(48.3)	51	(42.5)
Shun Tin/Shun Lee Estate	7	(5.8)	13	(10.8)
Kwun Tong Estate	2	(1.7)	2	(1.7)
Temporary Housing, Squatter Hut and Village House in Kwun Tong	3	(2.5)	5	(4.2)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

Number of Children

The number of children the two mother groups have is quite similar, only that the number of children of the non-compliant group is slightly bigger. Most of them have two to five children and the biggest percentage goes to three children - 32.5% in the compliant group and 26.7% in the non-compliant group. For the number of six children and over, the compliant group has a percentage of 11.7% and the non-compliant group has a percentage of 16.7%. On the whole, the number of children is quite big for both groups of parents.

Table V-16 : Number of Children

Number of Children	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
One	3	(2.5)	4	(3.3)
Two	19	(15.8)	25	(20.8)
Three	39	(32.5)	32	(26.7)
Four	26	(21.7)	20	(16.7)
Five	19	(15.8)	19	(15.8)
Six	6	(5.0)	7	(5.8)
Seven	2	(1.7)	8	(6.7)
Eight	3	(2.5)	2	(1.7)
Nine	1	(0.8)	2	(1.7)
Ten	0	(0.0)	1	(0.8)
Eleven	2	(1.7)	0	(0.0)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

Birth Order of Children

In both groups, most of the children under study are the youngest child of the family. This can be explained by the factor that Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping are "old estates" and the women belong to the middle-age group, so even the youngest child is between six to ten years of age. The percentage in the compliant group (58.3%) is higher than that of the non-compliant group (47.5%).

Table V-17 : Birth Order of Children

Birth Order of Children	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Eldest Child	22	(18.3)	38	(31.7)
Middle Child	25	(20.8)	22	(18.3)
Youngest Child	70	(58.3)	57	(47.5)
Only Child	3	(2.5)	3	(2.5)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

Mothers' Religion

Both groups of mothers have a majority believing in ancestor worship. This indicates that they are still quite traditional in thinking.

Table V-18 : Mothers' Religion

Mothers' Religion	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Buddhist	7	(5.8)	13	(10.8)
Catholic	6	(5.0)	3	(2.5)
Protestant	4	(3.3)	5	(4.2)
Nil	28	(23.3)	22	(18.3)
Ancestor Worship	75	(62.5)	76	(63.6)
Others				
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

To summarize, from the above frequency distributions, it is seen that the background features of the two groups of mothers under study are rather similar. Most of them are residing in Lam Tin or Sau Mau Ping Public Housing Estates. The mothers are mostly within the middle age range and have lived in Hong Kong for ten years or above. Most of them have over three children. The educational level of the couples is quite low, with an average of primary level. Most of the mothers are housewives and assume an active role in child care and discipline because their husbands have very long working hours outside the family. Among the working mothers, most of them are semi-skilled workers working in factories. The average monthly income is quite low - mostly between \$2,000 to \$3,000. A great majority of the respondents are ancestor worshippers. From the information gathered above, it is obvious that the samples of this study belong to the urban low-income group. Since most background features are quite similar, a comparison of parental support and control can be made on a fair base between the two groups of mothers.

CHAPTER VI

A COMPARISON OF THE TWO GROUPS OF MOTHERS IN THE ASPECTS OF PARENTAL SUPPORT AND CONTROL

Comparison of Parental Support Between the Compliant and Non-compliant Group of Mothers

In the previous chapter, it is seen from the various frequency distributions that the socio-economic background of the compliant students and non-compliant students is quite similar, so now it is crucial to see whether there is any difference between the two groups of mothers in the aspect of parental support and control. First, a look on some of the characteristics of parental support by their frequency distributions and a comparison between the group differences are presented. A t-test was performed to compare the means of the compliant and non-compliant groups in all items of parental support and the total group mean. (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner and Bent, 1975).¹

Measurement

Parental support will be measured on a high-low continuum. The instrument for measurement will be a 5-point summated score ranging from very frequently (5), frequently (4), sometimes (3), seldom (2) to never (1). There are 20 items measuring parental support. In each item, 5 scores stands for highest support and 1 score stands for lowest support.

Statistically, the group mean of parental support (N=240) is 60.8. Parental support is considered high if the mother's total score exceeds 61 and low if it is below 61.

Tonation of Voice in Teaching the Child

In comparing the mothers' tonation of voice in teaching their children, the group means were compared. Using a one-tailed test, the t-value (t=13.94) is significant at the 0.001 level. This indicates that there is a significant difference between the two groups - mothers of the compliant group teach their children in a warm tone more frequently than the non-compliant group. Children would feel less secure if their mothers always shout and scold at them when they are wrong.

Table VI-1 : Use of Warm Tonation

Use of Warm Tonation	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Never	1	(0.8)	15	(12.5)
Rare	7	(5.8)	71	(59.2)
Sometimes	44	(36.7)	28	(23.3)
Frequently	59	(49.2)	5	(4.2)
Very frequently	9	(7.5)	1	(0.8)
Total :	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)
t = 13.94	df = 238		p = 0.001	

Concern for the Child

There is a significant difference between the two groups in the area of concern for the child. Mothers of the compliant group showed more explicit concern for their children when the latter is emotionally dependent in times of sickness or despair. Mothers of the non-compliant are less sensitive to the children's emotional needs. Using a one-tailed test, the t-value (10.27) is significant at the 0.001 level.

Table VI-2 : Concern for Child *

Concern for Child	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Never	0	(0.0)	13	(10.8)
Rare	4	(3.3)	33	(27.5)
Sometimes	14	(11.7)	32	(26.7)
Frequently	80	(66.7)	42	(35.0)
Very Frequently	22	(18.3)	0	(0.0)
Total :	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)
t = 10.27	df = 238		p = 0.001	

* Concern for child refers to the mother's immediate response to the child when the latter is emotionally dependent, for example, in times of sickness or after scolded by the teacher.

Conversation with the Child

The mothers of the non-compliant group chat less frequently with their children, as a result, the children will feel neglected and may turn to be more attention - seeking. There is significant difference between the two groups of mothers in the aspect of parent-child conversation. The t-value (10.78) is statistically significant at the 0.001 level.

Table VI-3 : Conversation with Child

Conversation with Child	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Never	1	(0.8)	9	(7.5)
Rare	10	(8.3)	49	(40.8)
Sometimes	30	(25.0)	44	(36.7)
Frequently	35	(29.2)	16	(13.3)
Very Frequently	44	(36.7)	2	(1.7)
Total :	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)
t = 10.78	df = 238		p = 0.001	

Physical Expression of Affection

Though Chinese parents are quite non-expressive in showing their affects, it is found that the mothers of the compliant group are more expressive in showing affection to their children. So there is significant difference between the two groups of mothers in this area. The t-value (9.32) is statistically significant at the 0.001 level.

Table VI-4 : Physical Expression of Affection

Physical Expression of Affection	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Never	2	(1.7)	28	(23.3)
Rare	28	(23.3)	43	(35.8)
Sometimes	22	(18.3)	38	(31.7)
Frequently	46	(38.3)	11	(9.2)
Very Frequently	22	(18.3)	0	(0.0)
Total :	120	(100.0) (100.0)	120	(100.0) (100.0)
t = 9.32	df = 232		p = 0.001	

In addition to the above-mentioned items, there is significant difference between the two groups of mothers in all the 20 items measuring parental support.

Table VI-5 : Comparison of Parental Support

Item	Compliant(C) Non- Compliant(N)	Mean	S.D.	T- Value	Signi- ficance
Warm Tonation	C N	3.566 2.216	0.753 0.747	13.94	0.001
Concern for the Child	C N	4.000 2.858	0.661 1.023	10.27	0.001
Sensitivity to Child's Moods	C N	3.891 2.525	0.708 0.679	13.27	0.001
Comfort to Child Under Despair	C N	3.325 2.358	0.657 0.818	15.32	0.001
Forgiveness	C N	3.950 2.315	0.776 0.987	13.89	0.001
Arrangement of Adult during Mothers' Absence	C N	2.933 2.116	1.255 1.182	5.19	0.001
Encouragement to Solve Problem	C N	3.958 3.025	0.627 0.930	9.12	0.001
Trust in Child to have a capacity to change for better	C N	3.958 2.291	0.614 0.834	17.63	0.001
Talking with Child	C N	3.925 2.608	1.014 0.873	10.78	0.001
Physical Affection	C N	3.483 2.266	1.092 0.923	9.32	0.001
Choice of Toys and Clothings by Child	C N	3.383 2.691	0.891 1.002	5.65	0.001
Playing with Child	C N	3.008 2.075	0.921 0.900	7.94	0.001
Celebration of Child's Birthday	C N	4.066 3.091	1.121 1.472	5.77	0.001
Praises for Good Behaviour	C N	3.500 2.416	1.013 0.940	8.59	0.001
Recognition	C N	4.016 2.108	0.580 0.776	21.59	0.001
Appreciation	C N	3.916 2.250	0.574 0.748	19.38	0.001
Knowledge of Classmates' Names	C N	2.425 1.533	0.993 0.733	7.92	0.001
Supervision on Homework	C N	3.400 2.683	1.374 1.384	4.02	0.001
Checking of School Handbook	C N	3.683 2.750	1.263 1.374	5.48	0.001
Listening Child's Words	C N	3.875 2.658	0.773 0.845	11.64	0.001

* One-tailed test with 238 degrees of freedom

Table VI-5 shows that the biggest differences between the compliant and non-compliant group of mothers lie in the following items - recognition for child's merits ($t=21.59$), appreciation for child's uniqueness ($t=19.38$) and trust in the child's potential ability to change for better ($t=17.63$). The smallest differences lie in the area of homework supervision ($t=4.02$), arrangement of adult during mothers' absence ($t=5.19$) and checking of school handbooks ($t=5.48$). From these figures, we can see that the compliant group of mothers emphasize more on the emotional aspects of support while the non-compliant group of mothers are anxious about the child's physical safety and academic progress.

To summarize, parental support of the non-compliant group is lower than that of compliant group of mothers. The mean of support score of the compliant group is 72.766 while that of the non-compliant group is 48.891. There is significant difference in the total parental support between the two groups of mothers with a t -value of 18.76 at the 0.001 significance level.

Table VI-6 : Comparison of Parental Support Scores

Mothers	Parental Support		T-Value	d.f.	Significance (One-tailed)
	Mean	S.D.			
Compliant Group	72.766	9.355	18.76	238	0.001
Non-compliant Group	48.891	10.340			

Comparison of Parental Control Between the Compliant and Non-compliant Group of Mothers

In comparing parental control of the two groups of mothers, t-test was employed to compare the group means of various dimensions of parental control.

Measurement

Parental control will be measured on a high-low continuum. The instrument for measurement will be a 5-point summated score ranging from very frequently (5), frequently (4), sometimes (3), seldom (2) to never (1). There are 20 items measuring control. In each item, 5 scores stand for highest control and 1 score stands for lowest control. Statistically, the group mean of parental control is 66.8. Parental control is considered high if the mother's total score exceeds 67 and low if it is below 67.

Method of Punishment

From the table below, we can see that the mothers of the non-compliant group used physical punishment to shape their children's behaviour much more frequently in disciplining their children. There is significant difference between the two groups. The t-value ($t=13.83$) is significant at the 0.001 level.

Table VI-7 : Methods of Punishment

Methods of Punishment	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Physical punishment	14	(11.7)	77	(54.2)
Threat, scolding	21	(17.5)	31	(25.8)
Deprivation of love, isolation	4	(3.3)	3	(2.5)
Deprivation of favorite things and activities	13	(10.8)	6	(5.0)
Explanation, advice	68	(56.7)	3	(2.5)
Total :	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)
t = 13.83	d.f. = 238		p = 0.001	

Explanation of Consequences of Behaviour after Punishment

From the table below, it is obvious that the mothers of the non-compliant group are different from those of the compliant group - the former group explains the consequences of behaviour after punishment less frequently than the latter group. There is significant difference between the two groups. The t -value ($t=10.60$) is significant at the 0.001 level.

Table VI-8 : Explanation of Consequences
of Behaviour after Punishment

Use of Reasoning	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Never	1	(0.8)	14	(11.7)
Rare	3	(2.5)	30	(25.0)
Sometimes	17	(14.2)	47	(39.2)
Frequently	81	(67.5)	27	(22.5)
Very Frequently	18	(15.0)	2	(1.7)
Total :	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)
$t = 10.60$	d.f. = 238		$p = 0.001$	

Participation in Household Chores

Mothers of the non-compliant group request their children to participate in household chores less frequently than the compliant group. There is significant difference between the two groups. The t -value ($t=6.44$) is significant at the 0.001 level.

Table VI-9 : Participation in Household Work

Participation in Household Work	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Never	7	(5.8)	32	(26.7)
Rare	19	(15.8)	31	(25.8)
Sometimes	52	(43.3)	44	(36.7)
Frequently	38	(43.3)	13	(10.8)
Very Frequently	4	(3.3)	0	(0.0)
Total :	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)
$t = 6.44$	d.f. = 238		$p = 0.001$	

Methods of Approval

In comparing the methods of approval, it is found that 30% of the mothers of the non-compliant group give no response to their children's good behaviours. Even if they approve of their merits, they use material rewards like buying things (36.7%) and seldom use verbal praise (8.3%). Mothers of the compliant group use non-material rewards such as verbal praise (53.3%) and going out with children (22.5%) more frequently. There is significant difference between the two groups. The t-value ($t=8.25$) is significant at the 0.001 level.

Table VI-10 : Methods of Approval

Methods of Approval	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
No Response	8	(6.7)	36	(30.0)
Giving Money	2	(1.7)	5	(4.2)
Buying Things	19	(15.8)	44	(36.7)
Going Out or Playing with Child	27	(22.5)	25	(20.8)
Verbal Praise	64	(53.3)	10	(8.3)
Total :	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)
t = 8.25	d.f. = 238		p = 0.001	

Respect For Obedience As Positive Value

The mothers of both groups respect obedience as a positive value and there is no marked difference in this aspect. The t -value ($t=2.09$) is statistically insignificant at the 0.05 level. This can be explained by the Chinese tradition that emphasizes much in filial piety. Most parents think that they should be respected by their children.

Table VI-11 : Respect for Obedience
as a Positive Value

Respect for Obedience as a Positive Value	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Not Important At All	0	(0.0)	1	(0.8)
Not Very Important	0	(0.0)	3	(2.5)
Depends On Situations	5	(4.2)	11	(9.2)
Quite Important	35	(29.2)	33	(27.5)
Very Important	80	(66.7)	72	(60.0)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)
$t = 2.09$	d.f. = 238		$p = 0.05$	

In addition to the above-mentioned items, there is significant difference between the two groups of mothers in all the 20 items measuring parental control.

TABLE VI-12 : Comparison of Parental Control

Item	Compliant (C) Non-Compliant (N)	Mean	S.D.	T-Value	Significance
Let child know that mother is displeased when he misbehaves	C N	4.108 3.258	0.765 0.893	7.92	0.001
Use reasoning instead of physical punishment	C N	3.833 1.558	1.530 0.951	13.83	0.001
Explain consequences of behaviour after punishment	C N	3.933 2.775	0.683 0.983	10.60	0.001
Warn before punishment	C N	3.750 2.683	0.736 0.879	10.19	0.001
Value reasoning as the most effective control technique	C N	4.531 2.216	1.156 1.646	12.61	0.001
Use physical punishment as last resort	C N	4.126 2.756	0.645 0.902	13.48	0.001
Participate in household chores	C N	3.108 2.316	0.915 0.987	6.44	0.001
Use clear directives	C N	3.958 3.175	0.492 0.886	8.47	0.001
Focus on act when he misbehaves	C N	3.975 2.608	0.814 1.162	10.55	0.001
Use verbal praises when child behaves well	C N	3.291 2.416	0.844 0.922	7.67	0.001
Reward the child by material things when he behaves well	C N	2.583 2.383	0.866 0.954	1.70	N.S.
Reward the child by activity when he behaves well	C N	2.866 2.316	0.798 0.926	4.93	0.001
Use verbal praises more frequently than other methods	C N	4.083 3.716	1.185 1.373	8.25	0.001
Regard verbal praises as the most effective reward	C N	4.141 2.733	1.162 1.314	8.80	0.001
Repeat teaching	C N	3.800 2.383	0.655 0.927	13.66	0.001
Respect for obedience	C N	4.625 4.433	0.506 0.827	2.09	0.05
Be rational when exercising disciplinary techniques	C N	4.558 3.700	0.646 1.042	7.67	0.001
Punish child immediately after undesirable act	C N	4.291 3.566	0.666 0.827	7.48	0.001
Discipline child in private environment	C N	4.145 3.050	0.759 1.003	9.51	0.001
Be firm in rule enforcement	C N	4.258 3.066	0.652 0.883	11.93	0.001

* One-tailed test with 238 degrees of freedom

Table VI-12 shows that the biggest differences between the compliant and non-compliant group of mothers lie in the following items - use of reasoning instead of physical punishment ($t=13.83$), use of physical punishment as the last resort ($t=13.48$), and repetition of teaching when child misbehaves ($t=13.66$). The smallest differences lie in the area of reward of material things when the child behaves well ($t=1.70$) and the respect for obedience as a positive salient value ($t=2.09$). From these figures, it is seen that the mothers of the non-compliant group are less patient in disciplining their children and physical punishment is often used. The mothers of the compliant group use reasoning, explanation and repetition more often in controlling their children's behaviour.

To summarize, parental control of the non-compliant group is lower than that of the compliant group of mothers. The mean of control score of the non-compliant group is 55.924 while that of the compliant group is 77.957. There is significant difference in the total parental control between the two groups of mothers with a t -value of 18.61 at the 0.001 level.

Table VI-13 : Comparison of Parental Control Scores

Mothers	Parental Control		T-Value	d.f.	Significance (One-tailed)
	Mean	S.D.			
Compliant Group	77.957	7.775	18.61	235	0.001
Non-compliant Group	55.924	10.272			

Footnote

1. Norman H. Nie, C. Hadlai Hull, G. Jean Jenkins,
Karin Steinbrenner and Dale H. Bent, SPSS Statistical
Package for Social Science (2nd Edition) (New York;
McGraw Hill Book Company, 1975), Chapter 24, pp.267-275.

CHAPTER VII

THE CORRELATION BETWEEN PARENTAL SUPPORT, CONTROL TECHNIQUES AND CHILDREN'S NON-COMPLIANCE

In the previous chapter, the t-test is used to show the differences between mothers of the compliant and non-compliant group in the aspects of support and control in separate items as well as total scores. The hypothesis that there is significant difference between these two groups of mothers in the area of support and control is confirmed - the parental support of the non-compliant group of mothers is lower than the compliant group and the parental control of the non-compliant group of mothers is lower than the compliant group. However, just knowing the difference is not enough. In this Chapter, the correlation between parental support and children's non-compliance as well as parental control techniques and children's non-compliance will be computed.

Parental Support and Children's Non-compliance

First, a look on the frequency distribution of parental support between the two different groups of mothers is suggested. In the compliant group, only 11.7% of mothers render low parental support while 88.3% of mothers render high support to their children. In the non-compliant group, 85.0% of mothers render low parental support while 15.0% of mothers render high support to their children.

Table VII-1 : Distribution of Parental Support Between the Compliant And Non-compliant Group

Parental Support	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Low Support	14	(11.7)	102	(85.0)
High Support	106	(88.3)	18	(15.0)
Total	120	(100.0)	120	(100.0)

After having an overall picture of parental support by its percentage distribution, the strength and direction of association between parental support and children's non-compliance will then be measured. Since both the independent variable (parental support) and the dependent variable (children's non-compliance) are measured on an interval scale, the Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient will be employed to measure the strength and direction of correlation between parental support and children's non-compliance.¹ The computed Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson's r) is -0.7545 (N=240), showing a very strong inverse relationship between parental support and children's non-compliance. This means that the more non-compliant the child is in the school setting, the lower parental support he is receiving. F-test is used to test the statistical significance. It is statistically significant at the 0.001 level. When the Pearson's r is squared, another statistic is estimated, denoted by r^2 . This is an measure of proportion of variance in non-compliance explained by parental support. The computed r^2 is 0.5625. This means

that parental support can account for 56.25% of the variance in children's non-compliance. And knowing parental support, 56.25% of the errors in predicting children's non-compliance can be reduced.

Parental Control and Children's Non-compliance

First, a look on the frequency distribution of parental control between the two different groups of parents is suggested. In the compliant group, only 10.2% of mothers render low parental control when 89.8% of mother render high control to their children. In the non-compliant group, 89.1% of mothers render low control while 10.9% render high control to their children.

Table VII-2 : Distribution of Parental Control Between the Compliant and Non-compliant Group

Parental Control	Compliant Group		Non-compliant Group	
	N	%	N	%
Low Control	12	(10.2)	106	(89.1)
High Control	106	(89.8)	13	(10.9)
Total	118	(100.0)	119	(100.0)

Number of Missing Observations = 3

After having an overall picture of parental control by its percentage distribution, the strength and direction of association between parental control and children's non-compliance will then be measured. Since both the independent variable and the dependent variable are measured on an interval scale, the Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient will be employed to measure the strength and direction of correlation between parental control and children's non-compliance. The computed Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson's r) is -0.7641 ($N=237$), showing a very strong inverse relationship between parental control and children's non-compliance. This means that the more non-compliant the child is in the school setting, the lower parental control he is receiving. F-test is used to test the statistical significance. It is statistically significant at the 0.001 level. When the Pearson's r is squared, another statistic is estimated, denoted by r^2 . This is a measure of the proportion of variance in non-compliance explained by parental control. The computed r^2 is 0.5776 . This means that parental control account for 57.76% of the variance in children's non-compliance. And knowing parental control, 57.76% of the errors in predicting children's non-compliance can be reduced.

The correlation between parental support and children's non-compliance, controlling for the effects of children's sex

In this study, the number of boys in the non-compliant group far exceeds that of the girls and vice versa in the compliant group. In order to show whether there is a non-spurious relationship between parental support, control and

child non-compliance, the Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient in the male and female group will be compared with the Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient in the total sample.

In the male group (N=146), the Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient between parental support and non-compliance is -0.7133 at the 0.001 significance level. When compared with the initial correlation (-0.7545), there is only very slight difference. The Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient between parental control and non-compliance in the male group (N=145) is -0.7172 at the 0.001 significance level. When compared with the initial correlation (-0.7641), the difference is also very small.

In the female group (N=91), the Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient between parental support and non-compliance is -0.6663 at the 0.001 significance level. When compared with the initial correlation (-0.7545), the relationship between parental support and child non-compliance is slightly weakened. The Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient between the parental control and non-compliance in the female group (N=89) is -0.6964 at the 0.001 significance level. When compared with the initial correlation (-0.7641), the relationship between parental control and child non-compliance is also slightly weakened. This may be due to the fact that girls are less aggressive than boys, also, girls are generally more submissive in character.² So non-compliant behaviours in girls may be less frequent than those in boys. Nevertheless such a tendency is very

slight in this study. In the female group, there is still a rather strong and inverse relationship between parental support, control with child non-compliance. This means that regardless of sex, parental support and control are still the two strongest factors influencing child non-compliance. So the relationship between parental support, control and child non-compliance is not spurious.

Footnote

1. Norman H. Nie, C. Hadlai Hull, G. Jean Jenkins,
Karin Steinbrenner and Dale H. Bent, Op. Cit., Chapter 18,
pp.276-280.
2. Paul Mussen, The Psychological Development of the Child
(New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), pp. 95 - 97.

CHAPTER VIII

A TYPOLOGY OF PARENTAL SUPPORT AND CONTROL

From the above findings, the hypotheses that both parental support and control are inversely associated with children's non-compliance are confirmed. The direction of association is negative and the strength of association is very strong. But what about the distribution of compliance and non-compliance under different types of parental support and control? In this Chapter, a typology of parental support and control will be explored. The low support-low control type of parents is called the neglectful parents. The low support-high control type of parents is called the authoritarian parents. The high support-low control type of parents is called the permissive parents. The high support-high control type of parents is called the democratic type of parents. The terms 'authoritarian' and 'permissive' parents were originated by Diana Baumrind in her study on child rearing practices of preschool children in 1910.¹ The terms 'neglectful' and 'democratic' parents are developed in this study on an exploratory basis.

From Table VIII-1, it is seen that most compliant children's mothers are democratic with high parental support and high control (83.9%). These mothers were controlling and demanding, but they were also warm, rational and receptive to the child's needs. This unique combination of high support and high control encourage compliant behaviours in children because these mothers attempt to direct child's activities but in a rational, positive manner. They encourage verbal

give and take, and share with the child the reasoning behind their policy. They value both expressive and instrumental attributes, both autonomous self-will and disciplined conformity (Baumrind, 1970).² Such a type of mothers use reason as well as power to guide the child's behaviour.

On the other hand, it is also seen that most non-compliant children's mothers are neglectful with low parental support and low control (78.2%). These mothers neither love nor teach their children in a proper way. They neglect their children's emotional needs and fail to socialize their children to conform to rules. As a result, their children's behaviour are running out of control.

In the low support-high control cell, the mothers are authoritarian and favour punitive, forceful measures to control their children. They do not encourage verbal give and take and seldom express their feelings of affection towards the children. In this study, 5.9% of the compliant children and 6.7% of the non-compliant children have authoritarian mothers.

In the high support-low control cell, the mothers are permissive and make few demands for household responsibility and orderly behaviour. The emotional needs of the children are often recognized with outward expression of affection but the exercise of control is often avoided. In this study, 4.2% of the compliant children and 10.9% of the non-compliant children have permissive parents.

To summarize, such a typology serves the purpose of classifying parental authority and behaviour into four types and it may be concluded that high parental support coupled with control are most effective in developing children's compliance. This seems that either parental support or control is not adequate

in promoting compliant behaviour in children. A combination of both is necessary in fostering compliance.

Table VIII-1 : Typology of Parental Support and Control

Typology	Compliance		Non-compliance	
	N	%	N	%
Low Support-low control	7	(5.9)	93	(78.2)
Low support-high control	7	(5.9)	8	(6.7)
High support-low control	5	(4.2)	13	(10.9)
High support-high control	99	(83.9)	5	(4.2)
Total	118	(100.0)	119	(100.0)

Numbe of Missing Observations = 3

Footnotes

1. Diana Baumrind, "Socialization and Instrumental Competence in Young Children", Young Children, Volume 26, No. 2, December 1970, pp. 104-119.
2. Ibid., same page.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

Summary of Research Plan

The purpose of the present research is to study the relationship between parental support, control and children's non-compliance. A two group comparison was adopted to explore the differences between mothers of the compliant students and mothers of the non-compliant students. One hundred and twenty compliant students and the same number of non-compliant students were chosen by the teachers of fourteen registered Primary Schools in Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping from Primary One to Primary Three. The mothers of these two groups of students were compared in terms of parental support and control. They were matched for housing type, living area, marital status and accomodation with child, in order to isolate factors which might be extraneous to the result of the study.

The data were collected by means of personal interviews with the two groups of mothers. In the interview schedule, the questionnaire included basic personal characteristics and the following measurements : 1) measurement of parental support (20 items) and 2) measurement of parental control (20 items). Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient Test was used to test the reliability levels of the measuring instruments and the results were satisfactory. The face validity of the measurements developed by the author was ensured.

The t-test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the means of the two groups. The Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient was employed to describe and summarize the strength and direction of the association. The significance of difference was set at the 0.05 level.

Summary of Findings

There are three major hypotheses in this study. In Hypothesis I it is predicted that there will be an inverse relationship between parental support and children's non-compliance; that is, the more non-compliant the child, the lower parental support he is receiving. In Hypothesis II it is also predicted that there will be an inverse relationship between parental control and child's non-compliance; that is, the more non-compliant the child, the lower parental control he is receiving. In Hypothesis III it is predicted that there is significant difference in the aspects of support and control between the mothers of the compliant group and the mothers of the non-compliant group with similar socio-economic level and housing condition - the parental support of the non-compliant group is lower than that of the compliant group and the parental control of the non-compliant group is lower than that of the compliant group.

Parental Support, Control and Children's non-compliance

The findings confirmed the hypotheses that both parental support and control are associated inversely with children's non-compliance in the school setting. The Pearson Coefficient between parental support and non-compliance is -0.7545 and the Pearson Coefficient between parental control and non-compliance is -0.7641 . Such a strong inverse association supports my hypotheses and implies that inadequate parental support and control are two dominant factors in developing non-compliant behaviours among their children. On the other hand, this supports the view of many developmental psychologists

that parental firm control, when coupled with parental warmth promotes the development of such qualities as self-control and high compliance.

Differences Between the Two Groups of Mothers

Frequency distributions of the background variables reveal a similar socio-economic profile between the two groups of mothers. However there is significant difference in the total parental support between the two groups of mothers with a t-value of 18.76 at the 0.001 significance level. There is also significant difference in the total parental control between the two groups of mothers with a t-value of 18.61 at the 0.001 significance level. Such a finding confirms the hypothesis that there is significant difference between the two groups of mothers on the aspects of support and control.

CHAPTER X

RECOMMENDATION AND LIMITATIONS

Recommendations

The findings of this study indicate that inadequate parental support and control are strongly associated with the development of non-compliance among young children in the school setting. Given such a conclusion, the following preventive measures are recommended.

Family Life Education

Since low parental support and control are contributive factors of children's non-compliant behaviour, effective parent training programmes are urgently needed for parents to acquire some basic knowledge and skills of effective child management especially on the aspects of support and control. Most Chinese parents are less expressive in their affects and they should learn to communicate their love and concern to their children more explicitly. It is still recalled in childhood days when scolding and nagging stand for love but it is hard to comprehend if the recipient is not mature enough. So many children and adolescents of this day complain that they are neglected by their parents. Such an outcry of despair is especially thrilling to the heart when the suicide rate of primary students is increasing. The thinking of some traditional Chinese parents that "love for children should not be expressed" is wrong and someone should re-educate these parents. Now who are these "someones"? In Hong Kong, one will be impressed by the luxurious and grand campaigns launched by agencies working on family life education. However the

result of this study should broaden one's vision to have a real look on the family life education programmes. It seems that teaching family life in a large group, bringing parents and children to picnics or camping, or holding exhibitions are not enough in promoting effective parental behaviour. It should be more focused on the needs of the parents of different socio-economic levels. For example, parents of the lower socio-economic level should be taught how to express their love for their children, how to 'squeeze' their time to play or talk with their children and how to exercise firm and reasonable parental control even though they are illiterate. On the other hand, middle-class or upper-class parents should avoid spoiling their children by buying extravagant articles. Seminars with brief theoretical input and detailed practical applications are suggested for different districts with different needs and patterns. And of course priority of training should be given to parents of the lower socio-economic groups because they are more exposed to various kinds of pressures.

Family Service

Up to now, parental counselling is usually rendered by the family centres of the government and voluntary agencies. The treatment of these cases are usually remedial in nature. However this study offers the reader the insight that preventive and developmental service in the form of early parent training emphasizing on the dual role of support and control is more beneficial to the children's upbringing. Besides alleviating the presenting problems of individual families, it is suggested that small-sized parent groups be organized to conduct effective

parent training. Since there is a gigantic clientele existing, it would be a waste if one only looks at their surface problems. It is very meaningful to introduce the principles and skills of parental support and control to them.

School Social Work

From the study, a close link between the school and the family can be seen. It would be very convenient and convincing if the school social worker invite the parents to participate in parent training programmes. At present, due to limited manpower, the work of the school social workers mostly emphasize on casework methods and small group training is seldom employed. However group methods are more favourable on the aspect of parent education because it is an effective means of enhancing mutual support among parents which will in turn enhance the mental health of parents.

Using Behavioural Techniques in Child Management

Many parents intentionally reinforce their children for undesirable behaviour and get locked into a yearn of shouting in an effort without control. Conversely, they often fail to reinforce their children for desirable behaviours. Actually upbringing of children is a skill and has to be learned. In teaching behavioural techniques to parents in the form of parent groups, we can initiate behavioural change and maintain behavioural change in children. The principle of social learning, the importance of careful observation and accurate description of a child's undesirable behaviour, the concept of shaping and modelling, and the principle of negative

reinforcement and behavioural maintenance should be simplified and imparted to the parents. However the theoretical part should be very brief and constant revision, role-plays, case discussions, film-shows and home-visits should be used to achieve the objective. Such an approach will help parents to have firmer control of their children with the minimum of professional help and will result in greater feelings of self-confidence for the mothers.

Training of Staff

In-service training courses or seminars on effective parent training using behavioural techniques are urgently needed. The practical aspects of parent training should be emphasized. Role-plays and case discussions should be arranged for workers to reflect on the practical implications of parent training. Follow-up sessions in the form of home-visits in sustaining the skills acquired are also needed. In this way, worker will be more competent in handling cases with child management problems and parents will benefit more in real life situations.

Audio-visual Aids

More film-shows and slides reflecting parental support and control of the local scene should be produced. Cantonese tapes on effective parenting should be dubbed for easy circulation among needy parents. Also pamphlets and booklets written in simple Chinese with diagrams, charts and cartoons on effective parental and control should be widely circulated. Television can be used as an effective media of parent education.

Plays and dramas on parental support and control reflecting local characteristics are also very meaningful because nowadays even the lower income groups possess television facility. The impact of mass media would be far-reaching.

Research

This study is only an exploratory one on the impact of parental support and control on children's non-compliance. There is a lack of research in this area especially on the correlation between parental behaviour and children's behaviour. More in-depth studies in this area is recommended particularly on the potential determinants of parental authority and its relation to children's behaviour. Also as seen from the enthusiastic mothers during the scheduled interviews, it seems that structured interviews have limited the length and depth of their answers. Many mothers are very enthusiastic in revealing their parental behaviours. So a case-study of parental support and control will also be meaningful.

Limitations

As a final note, a few limitations of the present research will be briefly discussed here.

The definition of child non-compliance was narrowed to the school setting. It would be more perfect if the children's behaviour at home can be assessed. However, this would involve much subjective element of the parents. In view of the limited time and manpower, only non-compliance in the school setting was analyzed.

In the part of sampling, it will be more ideal if the number of schools of different religions will be the same. However, this is very difficult to achieve because in reality, the proportion of schools with different religious backgrounds is very uneven. For example, Buddhist schools are fewer than Catholic schools and Catholic schools are fewer than schools run by voluntary agencies and Protestant bodies. Also the number of non-compliant students selected for the study matches with the compliant group. However in reality, the number of compliant students exceeds that of non-compliant students. The equal-sized sample is used for easy and convenient comparison only.

Another limitation concerns with some habitual behaviours of the public when interviewed. Income figures were generally under-reported. Also parents will tend to be evasive in answering certain questions such as the type of punishment used. However it is fortunate that most respondents of this study are rather straightforward and frank in answering the questions and they are eager to seek advice on proper child rearing techniques.

To conclude, the pursuit of empirical knowledge is an incremental effort. In recent years more social workers are beginning to become more successful in making use of empirical findings. It is therefore heartily prayed that the findings of this research may be beneficial to the front-line workers who have committed their lives in the pursuit of human happiness.

APPENDIX I : QUESTIONNAIRE ON CHILDREN'S
NON-COMPLIANCE

The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Graduate School (Social Work)

A Study on Parental Support and Control Techniques

Questionnaire on The Selection of Compliant and Non-Compliant
Pupils of Primary One to Three by Class Teachers in
Lam Tin and Sau Mau Ping Area

Questionnaire Serial No.: _____

School : _____

Name : _____

Date of Birth : _____

Age : _____

Sex : _____

Address : _____

Telephone : _____

I. Family Situation:

1. Is the pupil living with his parents?

Yes : _____ No : _____

II. Behaviour Manifestation in the School:

	Frequently	some- times	Seldom	Never
1. Talking with other class- mates during lessons				
2. Leave of seat during lessons				
3. Unattentive during lessons				
4. Playing during lessons				

- 5. Answering back to teachers
- 6. Destroying school properties
- 7. Using other classmates' properties without permission
- 8. Speaking rough language in school
- 9. Does not hand in assignments
- 10. Does not complete assignments
- 11. Does not write up hand-books
- 12. Doing assignments untidily
- 13. Bullying other classmates
- 14. Quarrelling with other classmates
- 15. Fighting with other classmates
- 16. Running and clashing with other classmates during recess time

Frequently	some-times	Seldom	Never

III. Number of disciplinary actions received
(From September, 1983 till the present time)

- 1. Number of names taken down by prefect due to the pupil's non-compliance
- 2. Number of names taken down by teacher due to the pupil's non-compliance
- 3. Number of interviews with parents arranged by class teacher due to the pupil's non-compliance
- 4. Number of detentions after school

0 Time	1-2 Times	3-4 Times	Over 5 Times

- 5. Number of cancellations of recess time by teacher due to the pupil's non-compliance
- 6. Number of interviews with the pupil arranged by the class teacher due to his non-compliance
- 7. Number of interviews with the pupil arranged by the student Counselor due to his non-compliance
- 8. Number of interviews with the pupil arranged by the Principal due to his non-compliance

0 Time	1-2 Times	3-4 Times	Over 5 Times

APPENDIX II : QUESTIONNAIRE ON CHILDREN'S
NON-COMPLIANCE (CHINESE VERSION)

香港中文大學研究院
社工系學生專題研究

藍田秀茂坪區小學小一至小三年級學生在校行為調查問卷

問卷編號：_____

學校：_____

姓名：_____

出生日期：_____

年齡：_____

性別：_____

地址：_____

電話：_____

I. 家庭狀況

1. 該生是否與父母同住？

是 _____

否 _____

II. 在校行為表現

1. 上課時與其他同學談話

2. 上課或轉堂時超越自己座位

3. 上課時不留心聽書

4. 上課時玩耍、嬉戲

5. 對老師發怒

經常	間中	甚少	沒有

6. 破壞校內公物
7. 擅取他人物件
8. 在校言談粗俗
9. 欠交功課
10. 功課欠完整不妥當
11. 欠寫手冊
12. 習作草率
13. 捉弄欺負同學
14. 與同學吵架
15. 與同學打架
16. 在小息時跑、碰、撞

[illegible]

1. 該生被風紀摘名次數
2. 該生被老師摘名次數
3. 因該生行為不當約見家長次數
4. 罰留堂次數
5. 罰小息次數
6. 在校行為不當被老師約見次數
7. 在校行為不當被學校訓導主任約見次數
8. 在校行為不當被校長約見次數

APPENDIX III : QUESTIONNAIRE ON PARENTAL
SUPPORT AND CONTROL

A STUDY OF PARENTAL SUPPORT AND CONTROL TECHNIQUES

Interviewer's Introduction

I am a student of the Chinese University, engaged in assisting in a research project. It is hoped that through this research a better understanding of mothers' support and control techniques can be achieved. The information gathered will help us to suggest ways of making available, appropriate social services to mothers in need of help.

We shall be grateful if you will kindly help us by answering some questions. All information given will be handled in strict confidence.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Respondent's name : _____

Address : _____

Date of interview : _____ month _____ day

Attitude of respondent : ☐ co-operative ☐ ordinary

☐ unco-operative

☐ complete ☐ incomplete

(reason _____)

Signature of interviewer : _____ Tel.: _____

Signature of checker : _____

Signature of coder : _____

Remarks : ☐ questionnaire valid

☐ incomplete answers (please specify _____)

(A) PERSONAL PROFILE

I.D.

— 1-3

Card 1

— 4

1. Student's Group

1. Compliant _____

2. Non-compliant _____

— 5

2. Mother's age

1. 20 years and under _____

2. 21-30 years _____

3. 31-40 years _____

4. 41-50 years _____

5. 51-60 years _____

6. 61 years and above _____

— 6

3. Length of residence in Hong Kong

1. Born in Hong Kong _____

2. Less than 1 year _____

3. 1-4 years _____

4. 5-9 years _____

5. 10 or more years _____

— 7

4. Number of people in the family

_____ Persons

— 8-9

Number of children _____ Persons

— 10-11

Birth order of child _____

— 12-13

5. Mother's education

1. No formal education _____

2. Primary level _____

3. Secondary level _____

4. Post-secondary and
university level _____

5. Others (Please specify _____)

6. Mother's employment

1. Full-time (not less than eight working hours per day) _____
2. Part-time (less than eight working hours per day) _____
3. Housewife _____
4. No answer _____

15

Nature of work

1. Professional (Please specify _____)
2. Administrative worker
(Please specify _____)
3. Clerk _____
4. Service workers (e.g. barber, cook, driver etc.) (Please specify _____)
5. Skilled worker _____
6. Semi-skilled worker _____
7. Self-employed _____ (Please specify _____)
8. Hawker _____
9. Others _____ (Please specify _____)

16

Working Hours

1. 1-4 hours _____
2. 5-8 hours _____
3. 9-12 hours _____
4. 12 hours and above _____

17

7. Mother's religion

1. Buddhism _____
2. Roman Catholic _____
3. Protestant _____
4. Muslim _____
5. No religion _____
6. Ancestor worship _____
7. Others _____ (Please specify
_____)

_____ 18

8. Housing type

1. Public housing _____
2. Owned private flat _____
3. Rented flat or room _____
4. Temporary housing _____
5. Squatter hut _____
6. Village house _____
7. Others _____ (Please specify
_____)

_____ 19

9. Total monthly family income (Show card)

1. Less than \$1,000 _____
2. \$1,001 - \$2,000 _____
3. \$2,001 - \$3,000 _____
4. \$3,001 - \$4,000 _____
5. \$4,001 - \$5,000 _____
6. \$5,001 - \$5,999 _____
7. \$6,000 and above _____

_____ 20

10. Profile of Spouse

Age

1. 20 years and under _____
2. 21-30 years _____
3. 31-40 years _____
4. 41-50 years _____
5. 51-60 years _____
6. 61 years and above _____

21

Education

1. No formal education _____
2. Primary level _____
3. Secondary level _____
4. Post-secondary and University level _____
5. Others _____ (Please specify _____)

22

Employment

1. Full-time (not less than eight working hours per day) _____
2. Part-time (less than eight working hours per day) _____
3. Housewife _____
4. No answer _____

23

Nature of Work:

1. Professional (Please specify _____)
2. Administrative worker (Please specify _____)
3. Clerk _____
4. Service workers (e.g. barber, cook, driver etc.) (Please specify _____)
5. Skilled worker _____
6. Semi-skilled worker _____

7. Self-employed _____ (Please
specify _____)

8. Hawker _____

9. Others _____ (Please specify
_____)

_____ 24

Working Hours:

1. 1 - 4 hours _____

2. 5 - 8 hours _____

3. 9 -12 hours _____

4. 12 hours and above _____

_____ 25

Religion

1. Buddhism _____

2. Roman Catholic _____

3. Protestant _____

4. Muslim _____

5. No religion _____

6. Ancestor worship _____

7. Others _____ (Please specify
_____)

_____ 26

(B) PARENTAL SUPPORT (to the child chosen for this study)

1. Do you use a warm tone in teaching your child?

1. Never _____

2. Rare _____

3. Sometimes _____

4. Frequently _____

5. Very frequently _____

27

2. When the child is emotionally dependent (e.g. in times of sickness or after scolded by the teacher), do you shown concern for the child immediately?

1. Never _____

2. Rare _____

3. Sometimes _____

4. Frequently _____

5. Very frequently _____

28

3. Do you notice your child's happy moods and unhappy moods?

1. Never _____

2. Rare _____

3. Sometimes _____

4. Frequently _____

5. Very frequently _____

29

4. When your child feels depressed and cries, do you notice and comfort him/her?

1. Never _____

2. Rare _____

3. Sometimes _____

4. Frequently _____

5. Very frequently _____

30

5. After punishing the child, do you forgive and comfort him/her?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

_____ 31

6. If you have to go out, do you arrange your friend or relative to look after him/her?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

_____ 32

Why ?

1. No friend or relative available _____
2. He/she can take care of own self _____
3. Brings child out together _____
4. Others _____ (Please specify _____)
5. Not Applicable _____

_____ 33

7. Do you encourage your child to solve his/her own problem (e.g. wipe the floor after pouring some water on it)?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

_____ 34

8. Do you believe that your child will change for better after admitting his/her fault?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

_____ 35

9. Do you spend some time to chat with your child everyday?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

_____ 36

10. Do you touch or kiss your child to show your affection?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

_____ 37

11. Do you let your child choose the toy or clothing which he/she likes when you plan to buy something for him/her?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

_____ 38

12. Do you try your best to squeeze out some time to play with your child?

- 1. Never _____
- 2. Rare _____
- 3. Sometimes _____
- 4. Frequently _____
- 5. Very frequently _____

_____ 39

13. Do you remember your child's birthday and do something to celebrate it?

- 1. Never _____
- 2. Rare _____
- 3. Sometimes _____
- 4. Frequently _____
- 5. Very frequently _____

_____ 40

14. Do you praise your child if his/her behaviour is good?

- 1. Never _____
- 2. Rare _____
- 3. Sometimes _____
- 4. Frequently _____
- 5. Very frequently _____

_____ 41

15. Do you feel proud of your child?

- 1. Never _____
- 2. Rare _____
- 3. Sometimes _____
- 4. Frequently _____
- 5. Very frequently _____

_____ 42

16. Do you appreciate your child's strengths and do not compare him/her with other children?

- 1. Never _____
- 2. Rare _____
- 3. Sometimes _____
- 4. Frequently _____
- 5. Very frequently _____ 43

17. Do you know the names of your child's classmates or friends?

- 1. Never _____
- 2. Rare _____
- 3. Sometimes _____
- 4. Frequently _____
- 5. Very frequently _____ 44

18. Do you supervise your child's homework?

- 1. Never _____
- 2. Rare _____
- 3. Sometimes _____
- 4. Frequently _____
- 5. Very frequently _____ 45

Why ?

- 1. No ability to supervise because of low educational level _____
- 2. No time to supervise _____
- 3. Very tired, so no energy to supervise _____
- 4. Other helpers (e.g. tuition classes, elder siblings) _____
- 5. Others _____ (Please specify _____)
- 6. Not applicable _____ 46

19. Do you check your child's handbook?	
1. Never _____	
2. Rare _____	
3. Sometimes _____	
4. Frequently _____	
5. Very frequently _____	_____ 47
20. Do you listen to your child's words patiently?	
1. Never _____	
2. Rare _____	
3. Sometimes _____	
4. Frequently _____	
5. Very frequently _____	_____ 48
21. Are you satisfied with the care given to your child?	
1. Not satisfied at all _____	
2. Not so satisfactory _____	
3. Ordinary _____	
4. Quite satisfactory _____	
5. Very satisfactory _____	_____ 49
22. Please describe the relationship with your child.	
1. Very distant _____	
2. Distant _____	
3. Ordinary _____	
4. Intimate _____	
5. Very intimate _____	_____ 50

(C) PARENTAL CONTROL

1. Do you tell your child that you are displeased when he/she misbehaves?

- 1. Never _____
- 2. Rare _____
- 3. Sometimes _____
- 4. Frequently _____
- 5. Very frequently _____ 51

2. When your child misbehaves, what kind of punishment do you use?

- 1. Physical Punishment _____
- 2. Threat, scolding _____
- 3. Withdrawal of love, isolation _____
- 4. Deprivation of favourite things _____
- 5. Explanation, advice _____
- 6. Others _____ (Please specify _____) 52

3. After punishing the child, do you explain to him/her behaviour?

- 1. Never _____
- 2. Rare _____
- 3. Sometimes _____
- 4. Frequently _____
- 5. Very frequently _____ 53

4. Before punishing the child, do you warn him first?

- 1. Never _____
- 2. Rare _____
- 3. Sometimes _____
- 4. Frequently _____
- 5. Very frequently _____ 54

5. What do you regard as the most effective control?

1. Physical punishment _____
2. Threat, scolding _____
3. Withdrawal of love,
isolation _____
4. Deprivation of favorite
things _____
5. Explanation, advice _____
6. Others _____ (Please specify
_____)

55

6. Do you use physical punishment as the last resort
in disciplining your child?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

56

7. Do you request your child to do some housework
appropriate to his/her ability?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

57

8. Do you use clear directives in teaching your child?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

58

9. Do you focus on the undesirable act instead of scolding all his faults?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

_____ 59

10. Do you praise your child verbally when he follows your instructions?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

_____ 60

11. Do you buy something for your child when his/her behaviour is good?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

_____ 61

12. Do you bring your child out when his/her behaviour is good?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

_____ 62

124
13. What do you usually do when your child's behaviour is good?

1. No response _____
2. Give money _____
3. Buy things _____
4. Go out with child _____
5. Verbal praise _____
6. Others _____ (Please specify _____)

_____ 63

14. In your opinion, what is the most effective method of appraisal?

1. No response _____
2. Give money _____
3. Buy things _____
4. Go out with child _____
5. Verbal praise _____
6. Others _____ (Please specify _____)

_____ 64

15. Do you repeat teaching your child if he does not follow your instructions?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

_____ 65

16. Is it important for children to respect their Parents?

1. Not important at all _____
2. Not so important _____
3. Depends on situations _____
4. Quite important _____
5. Very important _____

_____ 66

17. Why do you punish your child?

1. Don't know the reason _____
2. Ventilation of anger _____
3. Let him know that the mother
is an authoritative figure _____
4. Teach him a lesson _____
5. Help him to be good and develop
a good personality _____

67

18. Do you punish your child immediately when he/she
does something wrong?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

68

19. Do you discipline your child in a private
environment?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

69

20. Do you keep your words when disciplining your child?

1. Never _____
2. Rare _____
3. Sometimes _____
4. Frequently _____
5. Very frequently _____

70

21. On the whole, are you satisfied with your control method?

1. Not satisfied at all _____
2. Not too satisfied _____
3. Ordinary _____
4. Quite satisfactory _____
5. Very satisfactory _____

_____ 71

If you are not satisfied, will you seek other's advice?

1. No _____
2. Yes _____
3. Not applicable _____

_____ 72

whose advice will you seek?

1. Husband _____
2. Friends or relatives _____
3. Neighbors _____
4. Professionals _____
5. Others _____ (Please specify _____)
6. Not applicable _____

_____ 73

22. If there are some activities on effective parent training, will you attend?

1. No _____
2. Perhaps _____
3. Yes _____

_____ 74

23. Is your husband's control method consistent with yours?

1. Very different _____
2. Quite different _____
3. Ordinary _____
4. Quite similar _____
5. Very similar _____

_____ 75

24. Does your husband share your burden in child discipline?

1. Never _____

2. Rare _____

3. Sometimes _____

4. Frequently _____

5. Very frequently _____

APPENDIX IV : QUESTIONNAIRE ON PARENTAL
SUPPORT AND CONTROL
(CHINESE VERSION)

問卷編號: □□□

香港中文大學研究院社會工作學系問卷訪問員自我介紹

我是中文大學學生,現正協助進行一項研究,希望了解為人母親者對支持及管教子女的態度和方法。現有一些問題,希望你為我們解答。所提供的個人資料將會保密。
謝謝合作。

訪問對象: _____

地址: _____ 電話: _____

訪問日期: _____ 月 _____ 日

訪問時間: _____ 時 _____ 分

被訪者態度: _____ 合作 _____ 一般 _____ 不合作
 _____ 完成 _____ 未完成 (原因 _____)

訪問員簽署: _____ 電話: _____

覆核員簽署: _____

編碼員簽署: _____

備註: _____ 問卷有效
 _____ 答案不全 (請註明) _____

A. 個人資料

1. 學生組別

1. 守規則 _____

2. 不守規則 _____

2. 母親年齡

1. 20歲以下 _____

2. 21-30歲 _____

3. 31-40歲 _____

4. 41-50歲 _____

5. 51-60歲 _____

6. 61歲或以上 _____

3. 母親居港時間

1. 本港出生 _____

2. 少於1年 _____

3. 1-4年 _____

4. 5-9年 _____

5. 10年或以上 _____

4. 家庭成員共 _____ 人

子女數目共 _____ 人

該子女排行第 _____

5. 母親教育程度

1. 無正式入學 _____

2. 小學程度 _____

3. 中學程度 _____

4. 專上或大學程度 _____

5. 其他(請註明) _____

6. 母親職業

1. 全職 _____

2. 兼職 _____

3. 家庭主婦 _____

0. 無答案 _____

工作性質

1. 專業人士(如教師、醫生等)請註明 _____

2. 行政人員(如經理、商行主任等)請註明 _____

3. 文員 _____

4. 服務行業人士(如理髮、飲食司機等)請註明 _____

5. 技工 _____

6. 半技工 _____

7. 自僱(如店主、廠主等)請註明 _____

8. 小販 _____

9. 其他(請註明) _____

0. 不適用 _____

工作時間

1. 1-4小時 _____

2. 5-8小時 _____

3. 9-12小時 _____

4. 12小時或以上 _____

0. 不適用 _____

I.D.

☐ ☐ 1-3

CARD 1

☐ 4☐ 5☐ 6☐ 7☐ ☐ 8-9☐ ☐ 10-11☐ ☐ 12-13☐ 14☐ 15☐ 16☐ 17

7 母親宗教信仰

- 1 佛教 _____
- 2 天主教 _____
- 3 基督教 _____
- 4 回教 _____
- 5 無宗教信仰 _____
- 6 拜祖先 _____
- 7 其他(請註明) _____

☐ 18

8 住屋性質 1 公共屋邨 _____

- 2 自置私人樓宇 _____
- 3 租賃私人樓宇 _____
- 4 臨時安置區 _____
- 5 木屋 _____
- 6 鄉村房屋 _____
- 7 其他(請註明) _____

☐ 19

9 每月家庭總收入

- 1 1,000元以下 _____
- 2 1,000 - 1,999元 _____
- 3 2,000 - 2,999元 _____
- 4 3,000 - 3,999元 _____
- 5 4,000 - 4,999元 _____
- 6 5,000 - 5,999元 _____
- 7 6,000元或以上 _____

☐ 20

10 配偶資料(指你的丈夫)

年歲 1 20歲或以下 _____

2 21-30歲 _____

3 31-40歲 _____

4 41-50歲 _____

5 51-60歲 _____

6 61歲或以上 _____

教育程度

1 無正式入學 _____

2 小學程度 _____

3 中學程度 _____

4 專上或大學程度 _____

5 其他(請註明) _____

☐ 21☐ 22

配偶職業

- 1 全職 _____
 2 兼職 _____
 3 待業、失業 _____

☐ 23

- 工作性質
- 1 專業人士 (如教師、醫生等) 請註明 _____
 - 2 行政人員 (如經理、商行主任等) 請註明 _____
 - 3 文員 _____
 - 4 服務行業人士 (如理髮、飲食司機等) 請註明 _____
 - 5 技工 _____
 - 6 半技工 _____
 - 7 自僱 _____
 - 8 小販 _____
 - 9 其他 (請註明) _____
 - 0 不適用 _____

☐ 24

- 工作時間
1. 1-4 小時 _____
 2. 5-8 小時 _____
 3. 9-12 小時 _____
 4. 12 小時或以上 _____
 0. 不適用 _____

☐ 25

配偶宗教信仰

1. 佛教 _____
2. 天主教 _____
3. 基督教 _____
4. 回教 _____
5. 無宗教信仰 _____
6. 拜祖先 _____
7. 其他 (請註明) _____

☐ 26

b) 母親對子女的支持(指對該學生)

1. 當你教導他的時候, 你有沒有用溫和的語氣?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 27

2. 當他覺得需要你時(如生病、被老師責罵), 你有沒有留意到並作出適當的回應?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 28

3. 你平日有沒有留意他幾時開心、幾時不开心呢?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 29

4. 當他因一些事不开心而哭泣時, 你有沒有留意他並幫助他平靜下來?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 30

5. 當他做錯事而你處罰他後, 你有沒有生慚他及原諒他?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 31

6. 如果你有事要外出, 你有沒有安排親友看顧他?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 32

為什麼?

1. 沒有相熟的成年人可以抽空 _____
2. 覺得他可以自己照顧自己 _____
3. 帶同他一起外出 _____
4. 其他(請註明) _____
5. 不適用 _____

☐ 33

7. 你有沒有鼓勵他自己去做一點事(如倒湯水自己抹)?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 34

8. 當他做錯事而認錯後,你是否相信他會改好?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 35

9. 你每日有沒有花一點時間跟他傾談?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 36

10. 當你要緩和關心他時,你有沒有摸摸他或錫他一下呢?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 37

11. 你有沒有讓他選擇自己喜歡的玩具或衣物而買給他?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 38

12. 你有沒有盡量抽時間陪他及與他玩耍?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 39

13. 你是否記得他的生日並作一些表示?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 40

14. 當他表現得很乖時,你有沒有稱讚他?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 41

15. 你有沒有覺得他很可愛，因為他而感到光榮？

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 42

16. 你有沒有欣賞他及留意到他獨特的地方而不將他與別的孩子比較？

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 43

17. 你是否認識他平日的同學或朋友的名字？

1. 毫不認識 _____
2. 知道很少 _____
3. 知道一些 _____
4. 知道大部份 _____
5. 全部認識 _____

☐ 44

18. 你平日有沒有督促他的功課？

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 45

為什麼？

1. 自己學問有限，沒有能力督促 _____
2. 沒有時間 _____
3. 自己太疲倦，沒有精神 _____
4. 因為有其他人幫（如補習中心、補習老師、兄姊等） _____
5. 其他（請註明） _____
6. 不適用 _____

☐ 46

19. 你有沒有查看他的家課冊？

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 47

20. 你有沒有耐性聆聽他對你講的話？

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 48

21. 大致上，你是否滿意自己目前對他的照顧？

1. 完全不滿意 _____
2. 不大滿意 _____
3. 普通 _____
4. 頗為滿意 _____
5. 十分滿意 _____

☐ 49

22. 你覺得自己與他的關係怎樣？

1. 十分疏遠 _____
2. 疏遠 _____
3. 普通 _____
4. 親密 _____
5. 十分親密 _____

☐ 50

C. 母親對子女的管教

1. 當他不聽話時, 你有沒有告訴他你不喜歡他這樣做?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 51

2. 當他不聽話時, 你喜歡用那一種方法處罰他呢?

1. 體罰 _____
2. 恐嚇、大罵 _____
3. 話唔錫他、隔離 _____
4. 剝奪他喜歡的東西 _____
5. 解釋、勸告 _____
6. 其他(請註明) _____

☐ 52

3. 當你處罰他後, 你有沒有向他解釋行為的後果?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 53

4. 當他不聽話時, 你有沒有先警告他再加以處罰呢?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 54

5. 你覺得最有效的管教方法是什麼?

1. 體罰 _____
2. 恐嚇、大罵 _____
3. 話唔錫他、隔離 _____
4. 剝奪他喜歡的東西 _____
5. 解釋、勸告 _____
6. 其他(請註明) _____

☐ 55

6. 你是否試過其他方法無效, 才執行體罰呢?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____
6. 其他(請註明) _____

☐ 56

7. 你有沒有按他的能力而要求他做一些家務?

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 57

8. 當你管教他時，你有沒有清楚及具體地說他應做的事？

- 1. 從未試過 _____
- 2. 很少 _____
- 3. 間中 _____
- 4. 經常 _____
- 5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 58

9. 當他做錯了某一件事，你是否只針對這件事教導他，而不會東拉西扯罵他一頓？

- 1. 從未試過 _____
- 2. 很少 _____
- 3. 間中 _____
- 4. 經常 _____
- 5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 59

10. 當他睡覺時，你有沒有用說話稱讚他？

- 1. 從未試過 _____
- 2. 很少 _____
- 3. 間中 _____
- 4. 經常 _____
- 5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 60

11. 當他乖的時候，你有沒有買一些東西獎勵他？

- 1. 從未試過 _____
- 2. 很少 _____
- 3. 間中 _____
- 4. 經常 _____
- 5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 61

12. 當他乖的時候，你有沒有帶他出外或陪他玩耍以作獎勵？

- 1. 從未試過 _____
- 2. 很少 _____
- 3. 間中 _____
- 4. 經常 _____
- 5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 62

13. 當他乖的時候，你多數會怎樣做呢？

- 1. 不作任何表示 _____
- 2. 賞錢給他 _____
- 3. 買東西給他 _____
- 4. 帶他去街或陪他玩耍 _____
- 5. 口頭稱讚他 _____
- 6. 其他(請註明) _____

☐ 63

14. 你覺得最有效的獎勵是什麼？

- 1. 不作任何表示 _____
- 2. 賞錢給他 _____
- 3. 買東西給他 _____
- 4. 帶他去街或陪他玩耍 _____
- 5. 口頭稱讚他 _____
- 6. 其他(請註明) _____

☐ 64

15. 當你指出他的錯處而他不懂時，你有沒有再向他解釋他為什麼錯？

- 1. 從未試過 _____
- 2. 很少 _____
- 3. 間中 _____
- 4. 經常 _____
- 5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 65

16. 你覺得孩子遵從父母的話是否重要？

- 1. 完全不重要 _____
- 2. 不太重要 _____
- 3. 視乎情況而定 _____
- 4. 重要 _____
- 5. 十分重要 _____

☐ 66

17. 你處罰孩子的理由是什麼？

1. 不知道 _____
2. 為了解決自己的情緒 _____
3. 給他一個懲戒，讓他知道母親是有權管教他的 _____
4. 給他一個教訓，叫他下次不要再犯 _____
5. 使他學好及成長，培養良好的品格 _____

☐ 67

18. 當他做錯某一件事，你是至立刻管教他？

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 68

19. 通常你在管教他的時候，有沒有在私下的環境？

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 69

20. 在管教他時，你講過的話是否真的會執行？

1. 從未試過 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 70

21. 大致上，你對自己的管教方法是否滿意？

1. 完全不滿意 _____
2. 不大滿意 _____
3. 普通 _____
4. 頗為滿意 _____
5. 十分滿意 _____

☐ 71

→ 如果你覺得不滿意，你會不會請教其他人呢？

1. 不會 _____

☐ 72

2. 會 _____
3. 通用 _____

→ 你會請教什麼人呢？

1. 丈夫 _____
2. 親友 _____
3. 鄰居 _____
4. 專業人士 _____
5. 其他(請註明) _____
6. 不適用 _____

☐ 73

22. 如果有一些活動是關於有效的管教方法，你會否參加？

1. 不會 _____
2. 或者會 _____
3. 一定會 _____

☐ 74

23. 在管教兒女的方法上，你是否與丈夫的方法一致？

1. 完全不同 _____
2. 不大一致 _____
3. 普通 _____
4. 頗為一致 _____
5. 完全一致 _____

☐ 75

24. 在管教兒女的事情上，你的丈夫有沒有派你分担？

1. 完全沒有 _____
2. 很少 _____
3. 間中 _____
4. 經常 _____
5. 非常頻密 _____

☐ 76

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerman, Nathan W. Family Process. New York, London: Basic Books, Inc., 1979.

Baker, Katherine Road and Xenia, F. Fane, Understanding and Guiding Young Children. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall. Inc., 1970.

Bandura, A., Principles of Behaviour Modification, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1969.

Bandura, A., "Self-efficiency Mechanism in Human Agency." American Psychologist, 1982, 37, 122-147.

Bartz, Karen W. and Levine, Elaine S. "A. Description and Comparison to Anglo and Chicano Parents". Journal of Marriage and the Family. Volume 40: November, 1978, - 709-719.

Baumrind, D. "Child Care Practices Antecedent Three Pattern of Preschool Behaviour." Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1967, 75, 43-88.

Baumrind, D, "Current Patterns of Parental Authority." Developmental Psychology Monographs, 1971, 4(1, Pt. 2) (a).

Baumrind, D. "Harmonious Parents and Their Preschool Children." Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4, 99-102, (b).

Baumrind, Diana. "Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behaviour". Child Development No. 37, 1966, pp. 887-907.

Baumrind, D. "New Directions in Socialization Research." American Psychologist, 1980, 35, 639-652.

- Baumrind, Diana. "Socialization and Instrumental Competence", Young Children. Volume 26, No. 2 National Association for the Education of Young Children, Washington, 1970.
- Baumrind, D., & Black, A.E., "Socialization practice associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls." Child Development, 1967, 38, pp.291-327.
- Baumrind, D. "The Development of Instrument Competence Through Socialization". A.D. Pick (Ed.) Minnesota symposium on child psychology (Vol. 7), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1973, pp.162-179.
- Becker, W.C. "Consequences of Different Kinds of Parental Discipline". M.L. Hoffman and L.W. Hoffman (Ed.) Review of Child Development Research, Volume One. New York: Russel Sage Foundations, 1965, pp.169-172.
- Braga, Joseph & Laurie. Growing with Children. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.
- Brophy, Jere. Child Development and Socialization. Chicago Science Research Associates Inc., 1977.
- Buriel, Raymond. "The Relation of Anglo and Mexican-American Children's locus of Control Beliefs to Parents' and Teachers' Socialization Practices", Child Development, Volume 52, 1981, pp.104-113.
- Chan, Daniel F.K. Report on 1981 Base-line Study on Evaluation of Family Life Education Service, published by the Control Guidance Committee on Family Life Education. Social Welfare Department and Social Research Centre, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1982.
- Chiu, L.H. "The Student Teacher and Discipline Problems", Journal of Educational Research. Volume 69, 1975, 1976, pp.69-72.

- Colonico, James M. and Darwin L. Thomas. "Role-Taking as a Function of Value Similarity and Affect in the Nuclear Family". Journal of Marriage and the Family. Volume 35. November, 1973, pp.655-665.
- Coopersmith, S. The antecedents of Self-Esteem. San Francisco: Freeman 1967.
- Craig, Grace, Child Development. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1974.
- Devito, Pasquale J. "An Analysis of Selected Behavioural Characteristics of Disadvantaged Students". Journal of Educational Research, Volume 68, 1974-75, pp. 173-181.
- Elkind, D. A Sympathetic Understanding of the Child Six to Sixteen. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.
- Ellis, Godfrey John, Darwin L. Thomas and Boyd C. Rollins. "Measuring Parental Support: The Interrelationship of Three Measures", Journal of Marriage and the Family, Volume 38: 713-722, 1976.
- Field, C.E. and Baber F.M. Growing Up in Hong Kong: A preliminary Report on a Study of the Growth, Development and Bearing Children in Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1973.
- Flavell, J.H. Cognitive Development, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Foley, Vincent D. An Introduction to Family Therapy, New York & London: Grune & Stratton, Inc., 1974.
- Gabel, Steward (ed.) Behavioural Problems in Childhood, New York: Grune and Stratton, Inc., 1981.
- Gelfand, D.M. (ed.), Social Learning in Childhood, Brooks Cole, Belmont., 1969.

- Gelfand, D.M. and Hartmann, D.P. Behaviour Therapy and Children: "a Review and Evaluation of Research Methodology". Psychological Bulletin, 69, 204-215, 1968.
- Glueck, S. and Glueck G. Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency, Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1950.
- Goode & Hatt. Methods in Social Research. Tokyo: McGraw-Hill Kogukusha, Ltd., 1952.
- Haley, Jay (ed.), Changing Families, A Family Therapy Reader. New York and London: Grune & Stratton, 1971.
- Handel, Gerald (ed.), The Psychosocial Interior of the Family. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1967.
- Herbert, Martin. Conduct Disorders of Childhood and Adolescence, A Behavioural Approach to Assessment and Treatment. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.
- Herbert, M. Emotional Problems of Development in Children, London and New York: Academy Press, 1974.
- Herbert M. Problems of Childhood: A Guide for All Concerned, Pan Books, London, 1975.
- Hildebrand, Verna. Guiding Young Children, New York: Mcmillan Publishing Co., 1975.
- Hoffman, M.L. "Moral Development". P.H. Mussen (ed.), Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, Wiley, London, 1970, pp. 261-359.
- Hoffman, M.L. and Saltzstein, H.D. "Parent Discipline and the Child's Moral Development". J. Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 45-57, 1967.

- Hoppe, Ronald A., Milton, G. Alexander and Simmel, Edward C. (ed.) Early Experiences and the Processes of Socialization. New York and Long Academic Press, 1970.
- Hyman, I.A., et al., "Padding, Punishing and Force". Children Today, June 1964, pp. 29-33.
- Kaplan, Margot. Exploring Early Children, New York: Mcmillan Press, 1981.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Behavioural Research: A Conceptual Approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioural Research. 2nd Edition, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Lam, M.C. Changing Pattern of Child Rearing. A Study of Low-income Families in Hong Kong. The Social Work Department of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1982.
- Lewis, C.C. "The Effects of Parental Firm Control: A re-interpretation of findings." Psychological Bulletin 1981, 90, pp. 547-563.
- Levy D.M. "Oppositional Syndrome and Oppositional Behaviour" In P.H. Hoch and J. Zubin (ed.) Psychotherapy in Childhood, Green and Stratton, New York, 1955.
- Litwak, Eugene and Meyer, Henry. School, Family and Neighborhood. New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1974.
- Loether, Herman J. and McTavish, Donald G. Descriptive Statistics for Sociologists. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974.
- Maccoby, E.E. Social Development: Psychological Growth And Parent-Child Relationship. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980.

- Medinnus, Gene R. and Johnson, Ronald C. Child and Adolescent Psychology. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1978.
- Minuchin, Salvador. Families and Family Therapy. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Mussen, P.H. Conger, J.I., Kagan, J. Child Development and Personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- Mussen Paul and Eisenberg-berg, Nancy. Roots of Caring, Sharing and Helping. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1977.
- Ng, Agnes. Social Causes of Violent Crimes Among Young Offenders in Hong Kong. Social Research Centre, the Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1975.
- Ng, Anges. Family Relationships and Delinquent Behaviour. Doctoral Thesis submitted to the School of Social Work, Columbia University, 1980.
- Nie, Norman H.: Hall, C. Hadlai; Jenkins, G. Jean; Steinbrenner, Karin and Bent, Dale H. SPSS Statistical Package for Social Science. 2nd edition. New York: McGraw Hill, 1975.
- Patterson, G.R. and Brodsky, G. A Behaviour Modification Programme for a Child with Multiple Problem Behaviours. J. Child Psychology and Psychiatry 1966, Volume 7, 277-295.
- Pilling, Doria and Pringle, Mia Kellmar. Controversial Issues in Child Development. London: National Children's Bureau, 1978.
- Pinkerton, Philip. Childhood Disorder, A Psychosomatic Approach. London: Crosby Lockwood Staples, 1974.
- Pringle, Mia Kellmar. The Needs of Children. London: Hutchison, 1975.
- Report on Working Mothers in Family Functioning by Hong Kong Y.M.C.A. and Hong Kong Shue Yan College, 1982.

Research on secondary School Students' Moral Judgement by
School Social Science, St. James' Settlement, 1981.

Ross, Alan O. Psychological Disorders of Children. A Behaviour
Approach to Theory, Research and Therapy. New York:
McGraw-Hill Book Company 1974.

Safilios-Rothschild, Constantina and Georgiopoulos, John,
"A Comparative Study of Parental and Filial role
Definitions", Journal of Marriage and the Family,
Volume 32: 381, 1970.

Satir, Virginia. Conjoint Family Therapy. California:
Science and Behaviour Books, Inc., 1967.

Schaefer, Charles E. "Raising Children by Old-Fashioned
Parent Sense". Children Today, Volume 7, No. 6,
November - December, 1978.

Schaffer, H. Rudolph and Charles K. Crook. "Child Compliance
and Maternal Control Techniques". Developmental Psychology.
Volume 16, Numbers 1-6, January-November, Washington:
American Psychological Association, Inc., 1980.

Smith, Thomas Edwin. "An Empirical Comparison of Potential
Determinants of Parental Authority". Journal of
Marriage and the Family. Volume 39 February, 1977
pp. 153-163

Stayton, D.J., Hogan, R. and Ainsworth. M. (1971). "Infant
Obedience and Maternal Behaviour: The Origin of
Socialization Reconsidered". Child Development, 42,
pp. 1057-1069

Straus, Murray. "Measuring Families". Handbook of Marriage
and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1964.

145
Study on Parenting - Parenthood in Contemporary Hong Kong:
The Experience of Mothers by the Boys' and Girls'
Club Association, 1983.

Thomas, Darwin, L., Victor Gecas, Andrew J. Weigert and
Elizabeth A. Rooney. Family Socialization and the
Adolescent. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books,
D.C. Heath and Co., 1974.

Towle, Charlotte. Common Human Needs. Washington C.D.:
Government Printing Office, 1945.

Walters, G.C., & Crusec, J.E. Punishment. San Francisco:
Freeman, 1977.

West, D.J. and Farrington D.P. Who becomes Delinquency?
Heinemann, London, 1973.

Wright, D.S. The Psychology of Moral Behaviour, Penguin Books,
Harmondsworth, 1971.

Yost, Edwin D. and Adamek, Raymond J. "Parent-Child Interaction
and Changing Family Values: A Multivariate Analysis".
Journal of Marriage and the Family. February, 1974,
pp. 115-121.



000449646